

# FORUM

NEW ROCHELLE PUBLIC LIBRARY

## C. B. C. on the Carpet

*Editorial*

## Democracy in Cold Storage

*E. B. Jolliffe*

## Economic Consequences of Price Fixing

*E. A. Beder*

## James Farrell's Crusade

*Samuel Levenson*

# CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

EDITORIALS . . . . .	131
C.B.C. ON THE CARPET . . . . .	134
DEMOCRACY IN COLD STORAGE	
E. B. JOLLIFFE . . . . .	136
NOTES ON LABOR	
G. M. A. GRUBE . . . . .	138
TWO POEMS	
RONALD HAMBLETON . . . . .	140
CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	141
THUNDER ON THE RIGHT	
FERGUS GLENN . . . . .	142
O CANADA . . . . .	144
THE WRECKAGE (DRAWING)	
LAWRENCE HYDE . . . . .	145
ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF PRICE	
FIXING	
E. A. BEDER . . . . .	146
DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME IN BRITISH	
COLUMBIA	
EUGENE FORSEY . . . . .	148
JAMES FARRELL'S CRUSADE	
SAMUEL LEVENSON . . . . .	150
FARMING WITHOUT DIRT	
ROSS L. HOLMAN . . . . .	152

## BOOKS OF THE MONTH

GO DOWN MOSES . . . . .	G. C. Andrew	155
KEEPER OF THE FLAME . . . . .	E. G. K.	155
OVERTURE TO DEATH		
THE CALENDAR		
MR. BABBACOMBE DIES		
SPADES AT MIDNIGHT		
JEWEL THIEF		
SWEET POISON . . . . .	T. W. L. M.	155
STRATEGY FOR DEMOCRACY		
. . . . .	C. B. Macpherson	156
WORK IN HAND . . . . .	R. F.	156
WE PRISONERS OF WAR . . . . .	P. A. G.	157
UNCENSORED FRANCE . . . . .	J. J. Knights	157
LABOR CONDITIONS IN WAR CONTRACTS		
. . . . .	Lorne T. Morgan	158
SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION . .	A. W.	158
BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . .		159

## THE CANADIAN FORUM

Eleanor Godfrey - Managing Editor  
L. A. Morris - Business Manager  
Published each month by  
**THE CANADIAN FORUM LIMITED**  
28 Wellington Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada  
Phone WA 5118  
SUBSCRIPTION RATE: TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM  
(Cheques must be payable at par in Toronto)

## LSR

The League for Social Reconstruction is an association of men and women who are working for the establishment in Canada of a social order, in which the basic principle regulating production, distribution and service will be the common good rather than private profit.

**ITS AIMS ARE—** To stimulate discussion of current social problems through public meetings. To encourage the reading and study of works on economic, political, and international affairs. To make knowledge and reason, instead of habit and sentiment, the basis of constructive criticism of Canadian society. To break down prejudice and build up a social faith.

Write for information to

NATIONAL OFFICE  
33½ Thorncliffe, Toronto, Ontario

## Current History

INCORPORATING EVENTS, THE FORUM AND  
THE CENTURY MAGAZINE.

This famous magazine, founded by *The New York Times* in 1914, is once more being edited as it used to be originally—as a monthly record and interpretation of history in the making written by professional historians and other specialists—without sensationalism, partisanship or the devices of cheap journalism. Each issue tells the month's story of the war in all its phases with the calm perspective that intelligent men and women demand. Thousands of readers regard it as the indispensable magazine of world affairs and certainly there is no other magazine like it published anywhere.

Annual subscription to Canada: \$3.

**CURRENT HISTORY** 225 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y.

# THE CANADIAN FORUM

VOL. XXII, NO. 259

FOUNDED 1920

TORONTO, ONTARIO, AUGUST, 1942

## *A Moral Obligation*

A SECOND FRONT was never more necessary than it is now. The margin of Russian territory which can be yielded up to Germany, no matter what the cost in German manpower, is rapidly nearing exhaustion. A few more hundred miles of penetration into the Caucasus may well throw Turkey into the German camp. And yet—the U-boat campaign has, it would appear, knocked any reserve pools of shipping into a cocked hat; the successful thrust into Egypt must have diverted British reserves of offensive armament into that theatre of war; but most of all, the lessons to be learned from the Libyan debacle about the relative quality of British and German armaments must give even the most daring commander food for sombre thought on the subject of a successful invasion from the west.

It may be necessary to open a western front, with little prospect of immediate success. It may even be possible to make and maintain a foothold on the continent. These are calculations which, in view of the tremendous issues involved in Russia at the present moment, we can only hope will be made with courage as well as wisdom.

The rest of the United Nations have a great and genuine obligation to Russia and it is up to the Canadian people to see that their part of the obligation is met honorably and in full.

## *Muddling Through*

RECENT GOINGS-ON at Ottawa have underlined the apparent lack of a coördinated government plan for our war effort. The net result of the avalanche of words poured out over Bill 80, following a similar avalanche during the plebiscite campaign, has been perfectly described by our contemporary, *Saturday Night*, in speaking of the plebiscite itself: "The public of the eight provinces has been worked up into a belief that

conscription is 'necessary,' though with no very definite idea for what reasons or by what standards; into a belief that it voted for the enactment and enforcement of conscription; and into a consequent feeling that conscription ought to be enacted and enforced . . . It has a sense of frustration, and it is going to hold Mr. King and his ministers and the province of Quebec responsible for that frustration." Precisely. But much of the blame for this unhappy result, so uncondusive to a united Canadian war effort, must go to the press of English-speaking Canada. Its campaign to elevate conscription for overseas service into an exclusive gauge of Canada's war effort had more to do with "working up," confusing and misleading the people than anything else, thus rendering its readers a disservice unequalled by the press of any democracy save, perhaps, that of France.

Now that it seems clear that Mr. King will neither introduce general military conscription, until forced by events, nor compel private industry to coöperate in an all-out integrated production effort with profits eliminated or cut to the bone, we are just where we were before—except that each month the need for firm and clear-headed action becomes more urgent. We are proceeding, it seems, on the assumption that Canada's manpower and womanpower are elastic and unlimited. No indication has been given that the government has established any yardstick for the apportionment of human resources to industry, agriculture and the armed forces. We are told one day by Mr. Thorson that we are approaching the limit of manpower, and the next day by Mr. Little that 250,000 more people will be required for industry and the armed forces during the next five months. We are not told on what system, or according to what plan, these figures are arrived at.

For all the public knows to the contrary, so indefinite is the goal set for the expansion of our industrial and fighting forces that we may be rapidly nearing the point where we shall have to curtail war production, as well as reducing to a

sub-minimum our necessary civilian services, in order to meet the commitments entailed in a growing army. There will then be no doubt about the necessity of general army conscription. This, it will be remembered, is what happened in the last war; and we were only saved by the armistice from facing the grim fact that we lacked the means of meeting our commitments. This time, with our industrial effort proportionately so much greater, the danger is increased. Perhaps, after all, something like this is in the minds of our fellow-citizens of Quebec when they decline to become enthusiastic about conscription for overseas army service.

## *Repeal the Ban*

ON FRIDAY, JULY 17, the Toronto Civil Liberties Association sponsored a meeting in the Maple Leaf Gardens in that city to protest the ban on the Communist party and the present form of Sections 21 and 39 of the Defense of Canada Regulations. Despite a violent thunderstorm over five thousand people attended. Mr. Arthur Garfield Hayes, counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, was the chief speaker and, without trespassing on the Canadian scene, threw into clear relief the present stupidity of the Canadian official attitude towards the Communist party.

Since then, the Hon. J. E. Michaud has resigned as chairman of the parliamentary committee investigating the Defense of Canada Regulations when that body decided to recommend the lifting of the ban against the Communists and some other organizations. It is now up to the House of Commons to see that this particular blot on the Canadian war effort is wiped out and this will provide an opportunity for the Commons to show that they know whom they are fighting with and whom against.

It is high time that all fascists were locked up and all those, like the Communists, whose immediate objectives are the same as our own, were released in order to promote our joint interests as effectively as possible.

If we can judge by the temper of the Toronto meeting, and we think we can, the people of Canada are in no mood to hamstring their present effort out of fear of some contingency which may present itself when the war is over.

## *More on the Budget*

WE ARE DELAYING a full length study of the budget until the next issue. At the time of writing, the budget resolutions are still

being discussed in the House of Commons in committee. One or two important amendments have been made, and others are still being considered.

One change corrects an impossible situation: it allows a wife earning an income of over \$660 to be treated as a single person, so that her husband does not lose his exemption of \$150 as a married man. This was obviously necessary, for as the resolution originally stood, as soon as the wife's income reached \$660, the husband lost \$150 in taxes, with the result that it paid the wife to earn less than \$660, until she could earn \$950 or more. This amendment will be a very great boon to young couples in the lower income groups.

The next will also be of advantage to them, for it allows new life insurance premiums to be counted against the compulsory savings up to \$100, and payments on mortgage principal on one residence, even though the contracts are entered upon after June 23, 1942, whereas originally deductions were only allowed on existing contracts.

There are other points, however, on which the minister remained obdurate. The exemptions for children remain fixed at \$80 on the graduated, and \$28 on the 'normal' tax. Stranger still, this normal tax remains at seven percent for a married man at all levels, so that the larger your income the larger your exemption under this tax, it being two percent on all incomes over \$3,000. One has often been told that rich men have expensive wives, but it is a little startling to see it recognized as a sound basis for tax exemption!

Worst of all, in spite of the strong protest from the CCF group, the 20 percent rebate on the 100 percent excess profits tax is to be returned quite unconditionally, so that it could be distributed as a nice fat dividend after the war. The CCF maintained that it should not be returned at all, but that if it were "such refundable portions . . . shall not be used for the payment of dividends, bonuses or otherwise disbursed except for the rehabilitation of the industry, the provision of employment or such other service to the Canadian people as the governor in council may determine." Only 16 members voted for the amendment.

There has been a great deal of discussion on the best methods of collection, and the manner in which collections at the source are to take place, and the methods have not been finally settled. It is amusing how heated Mr. Hanson got at the idea that a man should tell his employer what insurance or mortgage payments he had to make in order to get the proper deductions. It seems pretty harmless. He can always pay in full and claim a refund, though that might take quite a time.



## *The Century of the Common Man*

WHEN VICE-PRESIDENT WALLACE of the United States addressed the Free Work Association last May, he did much to dispel the cynicism of those disappointed and disheartened by the insubstantialities of the Atlantic Charter. He spoke with glowing sincerity of the 'century of the common man,' of the 'revolutionary march ... towards freedom,' which he saw springing from the successful conclusion of this 'fight between a free world and a slave world.' Moreover, the address effectively countered Henry Luce's 'American Century,' an imperialist concept which is rapidly becoming the doctrine of American big business. Significantly, Luce's news magazine, *Time*, had no mention of the speech.

But it takes more than a speech to win the faith and goodwill of the common man. Indeed, such public statements, unless they embody promises of concrete and immediate action, get very little further than the ears of the educated classes, who welcome or reject them according to their social philosophies, but who in either case suffer least from the economic and social problems which brought about the war and which impede its successful prosecution. It is promising, of course, that such enlightened men as Wallace may be directing American policy at the peace conference but the confidence of the common people of the world will only be assured by the practical realization of as many of Vice-President Wallace's promises as wartime conditions will permit.

## *Public Radio in Danger*

WE DRAW special attention to the article in this issue describing the grave defects in the direction of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation revealed by the parliamentary committee of enquiry. Every Canadian who owns a radio set is vitally interested in these revelations, since the fees paid by set owners provide most of the \$4,500,000 expended annually by the CBC as trustee for the Canadian people. Those who believe most strongly in the public ownership and control of radio will feel the keenest concern. For it is plain that the ideals and objectives envisaged when the CBC was set up as the supreme radio authority in Canada, divorced both from private interests and from partisan politics and responsible only to parliament in matters of major policy, have not been lived up to. On the contrary, the present management seems to have shown more desire to "play ball" with private interests and to defer to

political considerations than to fulfil the functions for which the Corporation was constituted. Instead of strengthening its own relative position in the broadcasting field, it has steadily contributed to the building up of private stations, while starving its own program department and, by its failure to maintain central creative direction, frustrating the more creative and constructive elements in its personnel. What good work has been done (and there has been considerable) has been accomplished in the face of serious internal obstacles. Its weakly deferential attitude towards private interests, both in radio and the press, is disclosed in the remark of Gladstone Murray when testifying before the committee: "There is always a danger that a regulatory body will be viewed by those it controls as a meddlesome bureaucracy, and particularly so in this case when in one sense we are operating a competitive business." This attitude is reflected in kindred statements by the chairman of the board. Private interests have never willingly accepted the public control of broadcasting in Canada, and are fully prepared to take advantage of the dereliction and complaisance of the CBC under its present direction and management to serve their own ends. In our next issue, we hope to present an analysis of the evidence given before the parliamentary committee showing to what extent this misdirection and mismanagement have jeopardized the status of publicly owned radio in Canada.



## C.B.C. on the Carpet

**W**HAT A CRESCENDO of folly this is, whereby the present board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation first neglect, and then progressively inject confusion into, the affairs of the corporation they are supposed to supervise! This year's parliamentary committee on radio has been calling attention to their ineptitude. Three men, M. J. Coldwell, CCF leader, Brooke Claxton, prominent Liberal from Montreal, and Gordon Graydon, a Conservative who believes strongly in government ownership, have been prime movers of this investigation. The facts they have unearthed are, to say the least, startling. The canker of disorderly management has been eating into the otherwise sound structure of national broadcasting. It must be stopped now before it is too late.

The license payers, whose money goes in millions of dollars to support this institution, are no longer being adequately protected. In fact the chairman of the board, René Morin, St. James Street financier, has shown by his contradictory evidence that he has been by no means consistently following the affairs of the corporation. The real "boss" turns out to be N. L. Nathanson of Toronto, millionaire and motion picture tycoon. When ousted last year, after a fierce fight, from Famous Players, quasi-monopoly that dominates the Canadian motion picture house field, Mr. Nathanson, when the dust of the skirmish had cleared away, told the press that he now planned to devote more of his time and talents to the important duties of the CBC. There were some at the time who thought this statement to be mere bombast. Yet it was the truth. As chairman of the informal finance committee of the board, Mr. Nathanson has been actively supervising CBC affairs, although actually to what extent is not certain, because of contradictory evidence given the committee on this question.

While it thus took the parliamentary committee several sittings to unscramble the story of Mr. Nathanson and the finance committee, it needed only a preliminary questioning of Mr. Morin to reveal the full extent of the dual controls with which the corporation has been saddled since the spring of 1941. For example, instead of one, we now have two cabinet ministers exercising statutory duties under the Radio Act. Mr. Thorson has certain responsibilities; Mr. Howe others. Also the board of governors has re-introduced the principle of dual managerial authority, a principle which caused the utter disintegration of the former Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission in 1936. Gladstone Murray is now "general

manager" in name only. Dr. A. Frigon, as financial controller and assistant general manager, has more powers than Murray and reports directly to the board.

Much of what has happened is in direct contradiction to the wishes of parliament.

The Radio Act, for instance, lays down the principle that a general manager must be responsible for administration. Except for a few limitations on expenditures he is supposed to be in full day-to-day control.

These irregularities have their origin in events dating back to 1939. Murray at that time had been in office for over two years, but that reorganization of staff which had been envisaged when the CBC took over the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission in 1936 had not yet occurred. Some new men had been hired but otherwise Murray had been merely reshuffling the "old gang." Worried by this lack of action, the board authorized one of its governors, the late Alan Plaunt, in company with James Thompson, a well-known chartered accountant, to make a confidential report on reorganization. However, when this report after months of labor was finished and presented, the board refused even to discuss it, and apparently has not done so yet, two years afterwards.

The reason for their refusal appears to have been that L. W. Brockington, K.C., who had been one of the foremost champions of an aggressive policy for national radio in Canada, was after November, 1939, no longer chairman. In any event consideration of the report was shelved from meeting to meeting and in the end, after showing infinite patience, Alan Plaunt in August, 1940, resigned in protest.

The acceptance of the Plaunt-Thompson recommendations would have meant the initiation of a much-needed housecleaning. For such a thorough sweeping into dusty corners a new and strong hand, however, was required. As for Murray, despite a flair for public relations and much brilliance in journalism, he had shown manifest deficiencies, both personal and otherwise, which were common knowledge. But the members of the board were vacillatory. They had excuses. To the argument that firm direction was needed in wartime they replied with the old proverb about changing horses in midstream. Finally, they adopted a curious compromise. To calm criticism expressed by newspapers, they passed a unanimous resolution of confidence in the general manager (November, 1940) and then a few months later (April, 1941) proceeded to demote him. They took away or reduced his elaborate expense and entertainment allowances and they appointed the assistant general manager, the cold, hard-headed but unimaginative French-Canadian engineer, Dr.

A. Frigon, to be financial controller. The intention then was to form an executive committee of the board to supervise both Murray and Frigon in their new functions, and to help clear the decks for better broadcasting. But dilatoriness ruled. The informal finance committee under Mr. Nathanson, which had no legal status at all, and every decision of which had to be ratified later by the board in full session, took over instead.

While Murray, with extremely limited functions, retained control of the program department, there, too, a split occurred. Full charge of all French broadcasts was given Dr. Frigon. This meant that there was now nowhere in the corporation a man whose duty it was to see that an agreed pattern of war broadcasting was applied equally to all Canadian programs. It was now possible to have one outlook guiding programs in the French language and another spirit motivating those in the English language.

These irregularities, of course, caused discontent and a lowering of morale among the employees. There had been other resignations, too. Donald Buchanan, successively director of talks and supervisor of public affairs broadcasts, left in 1940 in protest against the lack of coördination of war programs, and the functions he gave up were divided by Mr. Murray between Hugh Morrison and Peter Ayles. These two were now regarded by the rest of the staff as the handservants of the "general manager." Various intrigues began. The password of operation became: "Are you for or against me?" There were many, of course, who tried to keep aloof from this Byzantine atmosphere. A few managed to do so, notably O. J. W. Shugg, who at this time was busily weaving the pattern of national farm broadcasting, and Dan MacArthur, in charge of news broadcasts. Luckily, too, the higher officials, Ernest Bushnell, the national supervisor of programs, a tough but honest person, and Ira Dilworth of Vancouver, a regional director who was responsible for most programs of western origination, were both men of strong character and objective outlook. Between them, they kept the boat on an even keel. They have, however, recently been beset by supernumeraries such as R. S. Lambert and R. B. Farrell, who while not on the staff, have yet according to evidence been given high retaining fees on the recommendation of the general manager which are almost in the nature of salaries. Lambert, for example, writes CBC articles, gives broadcast talks and is an advisor on school programs, for all of which he is paid, at the present time, according to evidence submitted, almost five hundred dollars a month on the average. He had been an old BBC colleague of Murray's. Many thought that he was also acting

as unofficial public relations agent for Murray, but here is what the proceedings of the committee have to say on that score:

"Mr. Coldwell: I asked a question just now as to whether or not you had any knowledge of Mr. Lambert acting as a public relations officer on behalf of the board? Have you any knowledge that Mr. Lambert approached the president of the University of Toronto and objected to articles that were appearing in *The Canadian Forum* and which were alleged to have been written by a professor in that university?

"The Witness (Mr. Murray): I had knowledge of that after the event; but he did that in his private capacity . . .

"Mr. Coldwell: Do you think it wise for a man who has a retainer from the CBC to go to the president of the University and object to a professor writing articles critical of the CBC?

"Mr. Murray: Certainly not; and that view was expressed at the time."

From the almost one thousand pages of evidence that make up the printed reports of the parliamentary committee, one can find dozens of similar passages equally revealing, not only about Mr. Lambert but about others in the inner circle of Mr. Murray's associates, and also about the questionable personal expenditure of funds by Murray on "Intelligence Service."

The irresponsibility of the present management and board of governors extends into many fields. Private stations are allowed privileges which no parliamentarian dreamed they could be given when the Radio Act of 1936 was passed. For example, the governors at their quarterly meetings have devoted an altogether disproportionate amount of time to the reception of delegates from commercial groups. That alone explains the neglect under which the internal administration of the corporation suffers. All this could have been prevented two years ago, if the Board had only accepted the Plaunt report.

Needed immediately is a new general manager who will provide strong direction, who will do some discreet housecleaning and who will insist upon better coördination of wartime broadcasting. A dozen Canadians of talent can be named who might fill this job adequately, or one of the competent supervisors or regional directors, like Ira Dilworth of Vancouver, might be promoted to this post. Better appointments need to be made to the board itself; members such as Mrs. Nellie McClung, who through illness have not attended meetings for over a year, should be replaced, and others like Mr. Nathanson, instead of having their terms of office automatically renewed from year to year, should now be gracefully dropped.



# Democracy in Cold Storage

*E. B. Jolliffe*

**D**URING THE YEARS of the great depression, Canadian politicians were often heard expressing their doubts of democracy. Prime Minister Bennett himself gloomily warned that democracy was on trial, and there were many smaller fry who hinted that dictatorship was not without its blessings. The head of a great Protestant educational institution was not alone when he remarked that we had much to learn from Italy . . . Among the well-bred, the well-taught and the well-to-do, it became fashionable to charge several million voters with the responsibility for the breakdown of an economic system over which the voters had no control whatever. The breakdown had placed an intolerable strain on a feeble or purely formal faith in democracy.

Even in the midst of democracy's war for survival, the open doubts and forebodings have not entirely disappeared. We may expect their voices to become much louder and bolder when the men behind the voices lead us into the post-war economic crisis. Some of them will proclaim that the farmers, workers and fighting men, although perhaps entitled to credit and even a little glory for victory, are not fitted to decide what kind of society they are to live in thereafter. The ineffable impertinence of this suggestion will not be well received by young men returning to civil life with few of the illusions held by their fathers in the last war.

For the time being, however, most voices of the doubters are hushed or carefully modulated. From patriotic instinct or fear of losing largesse from Mr. Howe's department or some other excellent reason, it is no longer fashionable to dwell on the evils of democracy. It is not the time to draw attention to the demoralizing effect that demands of the electors are alleged to have on business men who enter politics. We shall hear more about that later.

For those who have no real faith in democracy, the only appropriate line of attack in wartime is an oblique or indirect one. Using the war itself as a pretext, the public is advised to take a holiday from the normal democratic processes. Our ancient liberties, it is stated, are in pawn for the duration. Just as wages, rents and prices are frozen, so, too, office-holders must be frozen in office and elections postponed. To save democracy we are obliged to make sacrifices of, among other things, a great deal of democracy itself. So runs the argument—an

entirely plausible one to all those who fail to understand the essential vitality of democratic forces or the power of collective effort.

The most persistent attempt to foist this doctrine on the public has been made in the province of Ontario. Here Premier Hepburn and the nominal leader of the Opposition, Col. George Drew, embarked on a freezing program at the very outset of the war. Here, by a conspiracy of silence, issues vigorously debated in almost every other province are ignored or pigeon-holed. By-elections are no longer held. The legislature has quietly abdicated its part in the affairs of the province and surrendered practically all its functions to the cabinet. The government, its supporters and its opposition, contrive to remain shrouded in well-earned obscurity, from which only the two leaders emerge occasionally to deliver terrifying pronouncements on the conduct of the national war effort and the grand strategy of a world war. Deputations from hard-pressed agriculture are politely referred to Ottawa. Labor disputes are left in the lap of Humphrey Mitchell, unless the government's own friends are deeply involved, in which event an expeditionary force of provincial police is despatched to ensure that the will of the majority shall not prevail. Thus the Ontario leaders have given as good a demonstration as any of how to put democracy in cold storage, as far as it lies within the power of a provincial politician to do so.

It is obvious that war emergencies demand adjustments in administration and even in methods of legislation. It is always a question how far these need be made without reference to parliament or the electorate. By no means so clear is the proposition that provincial and municipal politicians, who have no direct responsibility for the conduct of the war, are entitled to be excused from their normal obligations. The experience of most provinces suggests that there is no need whatever for democratic processes to be suspended in favor of arbitrary and irresponsible government for the duration of the war.

Even at Ottawa, where a flood of orders-in-council has almost overwhelmed the statute-books, parliament continues to review the work of the government. However futile that may appear to many of its critics, the House of Commons has been in session for a large part of each year since 1939. The present members were chosen at a wartime general election, and there has been no suggestion



that dominion by-elections should be abolished. Many of the principal war measures have been introduced in the house by the responsible minister and subjected to long debate and also to amendment. The prime minister has repeatedly been obliged to defend himself, which was right and proper, for the war would not go one whit more smoothly were he or his colleagues exempt from criticism.

By contrast, Premier Hepburn of Ontario has so arranged matters that his henchmen meet seldom, and then only to adjourn after a few days, there has been no general election and not a single contested by-election since 1939; no important legislation has been passed for three years; debates have been as dull and uneventful as the average shareholders' meeting; and the premier has joined with the leader of the Opposition in announcing that there was practically no business to be done. Not more than two of the gallant legislators have indulged in serious criticism of the premier—one was a Liberal fallen from favor at court, the other a Tory out of favor with Col. Drew—and their efforts were all-too-brief. Whether this strange harmony be the result of a conspiracy, a compromise or a coincidence, it has produced a stalemate in which the will of the electors counts for nothing and democracy has in truth been frozen.

Oddly enough, the electors, whenever they had the opportunity, showed little enthusiasm for the freezing program. The war was only a few weeks old when Hepburn proposed that municipal councils be elected for the duration or for at least two years. The councillors, more closely in touch with the public than Hepburn, were wary, and in many places put the question to a vote. All across Ontario it was defeated by crushing majorities and municipal elections continue to take place annually.

At the 1940 session, led by Hepburn and Drew, the legislature forgot their own business and concentrated their fire on Ottawa. A resolution of no confidence in Mr. King was gratefully accepted by him as an appropriate excuse for calling a snap election. The campaign which followed found Drew leading the Conservative effort in Ontario, while Hepburn took a position of malevolent neutrality, undermining the King machine without publicly committing himself to Dr. Manion's hopeless cause. The plan miscarried. Even in Ontario the Conservatives were soundly beaten. There was nothing to show that the electors preferred the Hepburn-Drew combination to any other.

It might have been expected that two years of war disasters would put the electorate in a different frame of mind. Both Drew and Hepburn rushed to the support of Arthur Meighen in the South York by-election. One of Hepburn's chief points,

be it noted, was that the CCF had done wrong in forcing a contest. This, as he has so often said, before and since, is no time for elections. However, he put forward a candidate himself in Welland, with the support of the Total War Committee and the Conservative party. The results in South York and Welland showed that the public had less use for Hepburn or his advice than two years earlier. By now, even he is aware that most of Ontario's people do not share his view of democracy or his other views about the conduct of the war.

Having been so frequently rejected by the electors—in every test since 1939—Hepburn's reluctance to risk his administration at the polls can be easily understood. As Col. Drew was associated with him in all these ventures, the Tory party's utter lack of interest—even in a by-election—is also comprehensible. That, however, is not the whole story of the paralysis which afflicts the old parties and their leaders in Ontario.

Even in wartime, the major share of responsibility for social services remains with the provinces. In some of his earlier budget speeches, Hepburn, who is provincial treasurer as well as premier, made some significant references to the growing public demand for better social services. He claimed the demand was being met, pointing to vast expenditures on new mental hospitals. The fact is, of course, that Ontario's services have been falling steadily behind those elsewhere. The Rowell-Sirois Commission reported the relatively wealthy province of Ontario to be spending less money per capita on public health than any of the four western provinces. The efforts of certain municipalities to establish decent standards of relief for unemployables have been ruthlessly checked by Hepburn with threats of discrimination against any who dared disobey him. British Columbia has increased the meagre allowance of old age pensioners by five dollars a month; Hepburn, with a surplus of more than twelve million dollars, would consider nothing of the kind.

It is true that some of Ontario's problems, notably unemployment, have waned with the progress of the war. It is equally true, however, that other problems have sprung up with the war itself, while still others remain as serious as they ever were. To mention only one: Tens of thousands of children have been temporarily orphaned by the migration of fathers and mothers into the fighting services and into industry. The results would be obvious to any socially conscious person. Juvenile delinquency has already taken a swift rise and the ultimate dividends of neglect will be costly. Even with the example of Britain before its eyes, the province of Ontario has done little or nothing to cope with this problem. Creches remain largely charitable enter-

prises and the government aims to reduce rather than increase the supervision of children's activities. Here is a job at which the province could substantially assist the war effort by facilitating the entry of more women into industry. When any such challenge presents itself, Hepburn and Drew prefer to pass by on the other side.

The democracy-freezing program is not as perverse or as senseless as it might appear to some visitor from Britain or New Zealand. It is a highly convenient policy for putting a blackout on social issues of which the electorate has become increasingly conscious in recent years. In the guise of preoccupation with the war effort, both the government and the official Opposition are able to stifle discussion, in the legislature and on the hustings, of certain embarrassing topics which go to the very roots of social security and human freedom.

Since the objectives of freedom and security and the right to make progress by democratic processes are very much at stake in the present war with Fascism, and since most of the fighting and dying has to be done by men whose families are the first victims of the neglect of irresponsible office-holders at home, the Hepburn-Drew policy of ignoring social issues has a direct connection with the prosecution of the war itself.

The public itself is not deceived. There never was more general interest in the issues Hepburn and Drew refuse to debate. Recent developments in other parts of the British Commonwealth have been noticed; the war has stimulated more lively attention to what happens elsewhere; the British example, in particular, is a potent one. The premier of Ontario and his colleagues have no more than a short-term policy, and even that is out of tune with every objective outlined by the leaders of the democracies, and hoped for by their people.



## Notes on Labor

G. M. A. Grube

**W**HEN DISCUSSING the necessary first steps towards a saner labor policy in the last issue of *The Canadian Forum*, I mentioned the recognition of trade unions as collective bargaining agencies in government-owned plants and corporations. It is obviously useless for the government to preach to employers that they should recognize the unions, if the government as employer refuses to practise what it preaches. Against this the government has hitherto set its face, and, when asked by Mr. Noseworthy in what government-owned war industry plants unions were recognized, the minister of labor, on July 13, answered: "None."

Nevertheless, a contract was signed in Vancouver on July 8 which, I hope (one still hopes!), indicates a change of policy. The contract is between "the Dominion Bridge Company, operators of the Burnaby Ordnance plant (*as agents for his Majesty the King*)" on the one part, and the United Steelworkers of America, Local 2655, on the other; it recognizes the union as the sole collective bargaining agency in the ordnance plant, undertakes to negotiate with a committee elected by the union, stipulates that members of the union shall remain so, and then goes on to other points not directly relevant here.

The importance of this agreement is clearly that it is signed by the operators on behalf of the crown, and it makes nonsense of the contention that no one acting on behalf of the government can negotiate with a union or recognize it. That contention always has been nonsense, but it is good to see it proved in fact. Let us hope this is only a beginning; if this new policy were generally adopted, it would go far to make for happier relations between the government and organized labor.

An ironical sidelight on the case is that it was when organizing for this union, and on this case, that Allan C. Wright was irregularly called up, and that postponement was refused him by the national service board because they had made up their minds that he was engaged in subversive activities! Readers of *The Canadian Forum* will remember that his call was cancelled by the Minister of National Services himself. It only shows that service boards had better not stick their noses into labor relations.

### Section 502A

Another encouraging case was the prosecution recently, before Mr. Justice Archambault, in Montreal, of Society Brand Clothes Ltd. for dismissing

men because they joined the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. Not only did the employer lose his case, but the judgment has some very interesting comments to make upon the interpretation of the phrase 'sole reason' which has always bedevilled section 502A of the criminal code ever since it was enacted in May, 1939. The judgment says:

If the employer wishes to dismiss an employee he may do so, but he cannot do so for the sole reason that the employee is a member of a lawful trade union.

This court must interpret the words "sole reason" (seule raison) in such a manner as to assure the realization of the object of this law and these provisions according to their meaning, intention and true spirit as prescribed by article 15 of the Interpretation Act.

Therefore, it is my opinion that "sole reason" in this article means the determining motive, the principal reason for action, the "Causa Causans."

Nor did the matter end there. The company appealed, and the case came up before the provincial court of appeal of Quebec, before Justices Bond, Barclay, Francoeur, Bissonnette and Casgrain. The grounds of appeal were two: that the offence in question was not an indictable offence, and that the judge had erred in his interpretation of the words 'sole reason.' The appeal was dismissed without a dissenting voice, and the judges specifically agreed with the above quoted interpretation of the words 'sole reason'; they stated that any other interpretation made the law inoperative, for, as Mr. Justice Bond stated, "the effect of article 502A could always be thwarted by invoking some minor dereliction as a concomitant cause for depriving the article of any effect."

That conclusion seems obvious, but it is worth a good deal to have it established in law, and the unanimous judgment of a provincial court of appeal is a legal precedent of considerable importance.

#### *The Wrong Attitude*

It is often said that "it does not matter what you say, it is how you say it that matters," and though, like all generalities, this is an exaggeration, it is perfectly true that the general tone and attitude of the authorities is of immense psychological importance. Nowhere is this more true than in labor relations, and it is a pity that the war labor boards—upon which labor representatives, be it remembered, can always be outvoted by those of employers and government combined—are often guilty of a forbidding, negative attitude, as if every concession was unwillingly wrung from them, and, furthermore, that they wanted to surround with official secrecy not only their deliberations, which is natural enough, but also their decisions and communications, which is not.

Both these attitudes, if reports be correct, seem to pervade the directives of the National Labor Board to its regional counterparts. Their attitude towards vacations with pay, for example, is essentially negative. Everybody understands that vacations may have to be refused or even curtailed, but the reasonable way to do this would be in consultation, and after frank discussion, with the unions. Instead, instructions go out (June) that where a vacation plan was in effect on Nov. 15, 1941, it must not be interfered with, but where there was no such plan, none can be established, apparently irrespective of the work, conditions of employment, or any other circumstances. Such directives seem to betray such an attitude towards labor as: "You can't take away what they have or they'll make a row, but don't give them any more nohow." It is similar to the payment of the bonus only to those who had it at a certain date, but to no one else. It freezes all inequalities and is the very antithesis of effective, intelligent and rational planning.

As for the secrecy, in March the executive director of the national war labor board evidently contemplated the inclusion in P.C. 8253 of a statement that would make it an offence for anyone to copy or quote from a communication from a war labor board without such board's permission. This would mean that no labor organizer would be free, without special permission, to tell his union members what reply he has received from the board about their case—which is, of course, ridiculous. It is also dangerous, for where an abundance of petty officials clothe their own words with the awesome aura of secrets of state, then democracy is in danger indeed. As far as I know, this pompous suggestion was not carried into effect. But evidently the executive director saw nothing wrong with it.

All this is such a pity, and so unnecessary. It reminds one of that supreme example of tactlessness, to put it mildly, when after a dispute as to whether men should work six or seven days in the shipyards of the Pacific coast, and the men had agreed to try out the suggested seven days for a month, Mr. Humphrey Mitchell announced the passing of an order in council making the seven days compulsory. That's his bright way of avoiding further trouble. What a man!

(Correction: We regret that, owing to a misprint Prof. Grube, in his article last month, was made to say that the "employers" asked the government to take over the Dumart plant. It was, of course, the "employees.")



# Two Poems

*Ronald Hambleton*

## Samson

Wait till you see Dalilah. She's his other senses  
Here is this place where nothing actively happens.  
She's the pillar now, with the guarded sides  
He clings to blindly.

Wait till you see his lover. He feels her  
Carefully ponderous eyes, which is a  
Missing sense; which is a support  
To weigh back against at sweet night.

At night letting his front drip off  
She passes as the crowds pass, truncating  
Strength after strength, down to the roots  
Of his eyes, the medicine of absence.

---

Last night when fevered minutes  
At length lay exhausted  
And the quiet time began its  
Deliberate contriving,  
Determined on giving

To the fret it had ousted  
A new sort of living,

I, ambushed within your  
Disguising covert,  
Became the reviewer  
Of actions and motives,  
Feeling assertive

But secretly cowered  
And mentally furtive.

As if our Duality  
Had eclipsed my Self,  
And by some agility  
Kept acres pressed  
For our interest

Into the sweet gulf  
Of your lips and breast.

Then, dearest, you were asleep,

And I was free to become  
Faithless, or to weep  
At misery, or contemplate;  
To murder or create,  
Or even to succumb  
To a bourgeois fate.

That is, when we're beyond  
Temptation, we may attempt,  
Like the tempted don  
Or the selfhanged student,  
A new excitant,  
For the moment exempt  
From ties and imprudent.

But the only attractive  
Prospect was outlined  
In the perspective  
Of our two eyes' vision,  
As it brought Reason  
Further inland  
To its right position.

That was what I, beneath  
Your web of travelled hair  
Over my eyes, and the path  
Your hand made down my face,  
Thought as I felt the space  
Widen between what we were  
And what will replace.

For in this revolt  
The rebels have fled  
Before the assault;  
And we stand silent  
Knowing the excellent  
Journey travelled  
To a fertile island.





# Correspondence

The Editor

Sir,

Professor Scott's article on the "No" vote was doubtless intended to promote mutual understanding between English and French Canada. It seems to me admirably designed to do the opposite. It can scarcely fail to be accepted by many French-Canadians as proof that much of the most rabid Nationalist propaganda was fully justified. Many English-Canadians are certain to resent bitterly its general tone and the patent inaccuracy of many of its specific statements. Space permits only a few examples.

(1) "It is English-speaking Canadians who have been in charge of the major domestic decisions in this as in past war." At the time of the South African war, Laurier was prime minister, with two French-Canadian colleagues, one of them the redoubtable J. I. Tarte. In 1914 there were three French-Canadian ministers. Throughout most of this war there have been five. French-Canadian ministers have been in charge of the Defense Regulations and, till recently, of the censorship. A French-Canadian is the real general manager of the CBC. Is it English-Canadians who insist on maintaining relations with Vichy? Was it English-Canadians who insisted on the plebiscite?

(2) In South Africa, Ireland, India, Burma and Quebec, there is "one common factor . . . which may go a long way toward explaining" the situations. "It is the factor of British rule OVER these races." Here "British rule" is used to cover six totally distinct things. Ireland, till 1922, though represented in the House of Commons on the same basis as Britain, was ruled in the main by British officials. Northeast Ulster is still part of the United Kingdom, for the good and sufficient reason that it wants to be. Eire, for all practical purposes, is no more under "British rule" than China. South Africa is ruled by South Africans; apart from the Simonstown naval base, it is no more under the control of the British government than Mexico. India is, and Burma was, ruled by British officials, though the acts of 1935 provided for an appreciable degree of local self-government. Quebec, over a wide range of subjects, is ruled entirely by Quebecers; in other matters, it is like the other provinces, ruled by Canadians as a whole, of whom less than half are of British descent, and nearly a third French. "British rule" in Quebec is as much like "British rule" in India and Burma as chalk is like cheese.

(3) Quebecers "want democracy at home before they begin dying for it abroad." Quebec has, and has had for years, just as much democracy as any other part of Canada, or any part of the United Kingdom, or the United States.

(4) In 1917, the conscription issue was raised "by a group of Toronto imperialists and a small clique in the Conservative party" and "used . . . as a weapon with which to defeat the Liberal party." Hence, no doubt, the support of Mr. Rowell, Ontario Liberal leader; Mr. Crerar, the present minister of mines and resources; Mr. Carvell, one of the bitterest Liberal partisans who ever sat in parliament; Mr. Calder, then master of the Saskatchewan Liberal machine; Mr. Sifton, Liberal premier of Alberta; and Mr. Guthrie, then regarded as the prospective Liberal minister of justice. All of these entered the Union government. Hence also the support of such notorious Toronto Conservatives as Mr. J. W.

Dafoe of the Winnipeg Free Press; Mr. Fielding, for 15 years Laurier's finance minister; and Dr. Michael Clark, Alberta free trader.

I cannot forbear a final word on the curious logic which accepts without a quiver conscription for service in "Alaska, Greenland, or Panama," but recoils in horror from conscription for overseas. Why should Canadians "be forced to defend" the Danish and American empires any more than the British? EUGENE FORSEY

The Editor,

The Canadian Forum.

Dear Sir:

Having just finished reading the June issue of the Canadian Forum, I would like to express my appreciation of F. R. Scott's article, "What did 'No' Mean?" It puts the attitudes of French Canadians on the plebiscite question in a clearer light than I have yet seen in print.

During several months' stay in the West this past year, I found it extremely difficult to "explain French Quebec" to relatives and friends. Profound ignorance among westerners of Canadian history, both French and British periods, is, I think, a major factor. There is also an unwillingness to "take time off for a little self-criticism," especially in matters relating to British Empire connections and British policies towards colonial possessions, past and present.

Yours very truly,

Eva R. Younge,

Montreal, P.Q.

## TOMORROW

### THE MAGAZINE OF THE FUTURE

Is read by men and women who appreciate stimulating analyses of new world trends and occurrences.

TOMORROW gathers from the most enlightened free minds of today their ideas for a better future. These capable analysts of the new era are drawn from the fields of science, philosophy, religion and creative arts.

In the August issue: *Mussert—Would-be Dictator of Holland*, by Hendrik Willem van Loon, *Martinique: Lorelei of the Caribbean*, by Helen Augue, *A Letter to England*, by Cecil Roberts, *The Man of the Hour of Greece*, by Chryst Loukas, *A Footnote to History*, by Alfred Noyes.

IN CANADA - - 12 ISSUES \$3.00  
SPECIAL OFFER TO FORUM  
READERS - - 8 ISSUES \$2.00

TOMORROW - E. 44TH ST. - NEW YORK, N.Y.

# Thunder on the Right

Fergus Glenn

**T**O THE COMMON PEOPLE of the world, victory in this war will be an empty one unless it ensures for them a way of life far different from that which they have known. No other issue could justify such colossal expenditures of blood, toil, sweat and tears. No other aim is capable of fusing democratic effort into a will-to-victory powerful enough to overcome the ruthless fanaticism of our enemies.

Those who have voiced this truth have been accused of using the war to advance radical ideas. But if further sanction were needed, it would be found in the plans now brewing for a return to the legalized exploitation of human and material resources which sucked at the roots of pre-war western democracy.

The war has forced the abandonment of a good deal of the regimentation and looting of the common people which went under the name of "free enterprise" and which identified itself falsely with the very theory of democracy. But the reluctance with which vested interests have surrendered their privileges, even for the vital purpose of winning the war, has been patent to all except those who were blinded by the shimmering mirages of the old order. Now the rising clamor for immediate restoration of these privileges when the war ends is hardening into an organized drive. The real nature of the demand is being obscured by tardy admissions of the past "errors" of capitalism, and by attempts to present socialism as an "unworkable" alternative, partaking of the nature of fascism.

This campaign has been proceeding intermittently in such organs of big business as the *Financial Post*, the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, to mention only a few. Now it acquires a sharper definition in a feature editorial in the June issue of *Canadian Business*, mouthpiece of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Using as text an article by Thurman Arnold in which he declares himself as "convinced that the war will save private enterprise," the writer issues a call to Canadian business men to unite in a propaganda drive "to revitalize our faith in free enterprise—in its immediate possibilities, and in the advantages which it may bring to a hungry and eager post-war world."

Some Canadian business men, confronted with the likelihood that "the careless promises of those who would usurp control in the name of the state

may temporarily blind the people of Canada to the dangers and regimentation of a socialistic regime," are, in the opinion of *Canadian Business*, guilty of a deplorable "economic defeatism" in remaining inactive before such a grave peril. Happily, these faint-hearted brethren are in the minority, but such a "laissez-faire attitude," it thinks, may have serious repercussions. Says the writer: "Encouragement is needed if those capable of strong industrial leadership are to assume their rightful place in the free world of tomorrow. Otherwise we may find second-raters in the position of authority."

The picture painted of a Canada dominated by "second-raters" (i.e., socialists) is a lurid one. "Socialism," declares the writer, "can only succeed if those in control have absolute power over industry and business. To achieve and maintain this power necessitates a Gestapo—and terror." By contrast, a post-war world in which "free enterprise" prevails is full of mouth-watering "possibilities," the more so because of developments that are taking place in wartime. "At the same time that the public is saving its money and doing without, industry is developing exciting new materials and is expanding productive capacities to the point where costs can be radically reduced. After the war, these new materials will enter into aggressive competition with pre-war materials and with each other. If a free, competitive, capitalistic system is allowed to function without socialistic meddling, the trend towards still lower costs will build up such huge consumptive capacities for the new products which will be available that there will be no time for idleness on the part of anyone."

It is indeed an enticing picture—for those in positions of control in a world still open to the pursuit of private profit. The familiar capitalist heaven will be gilded still more gaudily by postponed spending and the unleashing of productive capacity and scientific development brought about by wartime removal of capitalist obstruction. We must excuse the peculiar imagery which envisages "materials" competing with each other as though they were animate and self-actuating creatures. The business man is full of romantic and sentimental ideas which his jargon reflects. In the same way he speaks of "advertising" as having an independent existence, and is never tired of talking about "the benefits conferred by advertising." The spectacle of rival materials engaged in mortal

combat to reduce costs while the humble consumer dodges about underfoot endeavoring to evade the giant talons of the combatants and waiting hopefully for some ultimate benefit to himself, is not without humor—though it becomes rather confusing when we are told in the next phrase that somehow the consumer (as worker) will himself be taking part in the fight and will have “no time for idleness.” But after all, the capitalist world has always seemed a little like “Alice Through the Looking Glass.” We realize well enough what is meant. It is not really the materials that will be doing the fighting. It is those who command the money power to get control of them, so that they may be employed, not primarily for the good of the community, but for the profit of a scheming few. If, in the course of this competitive struggle, a small fraction of the cost to the consumer should get knocked off, he can be sure that such a “trend” will not become very marked under a “free, competitive, capitalistic system allowed to function without socialistic meddling.” For then profits would tend to disappear, and who would care any more about the “exciting new materials” and their “possibilities”?

The only encouraging note in all this mumbo jumbo is the apparent recognition, by those who seek the post-war continuance of capitalist privileges, that the flies in the amber are becoming too apparent even for some of their own theorists. Lest the memory of capitalism's past failures and inadequacies spoil the picture, *Canadian Business* hastens to concede some mistakes. “In the past, capitalism has erred, and erred often” it declares, “but its mistakes have been magnified and distorted to an extent where even the word is repugnant to many people. But capitalism has gone through fire. It is closer to workability than any system which could be whipped into shape for at least a generation, and then only under ruthless authority. Its healthy advantages have been inadequately explained. The public knows only the past abuses. Besides, business men seem to fear the vituperations of those more skilled in ridicule and abuse than they. Business men have woefully neglected this field of propaganda. Accustomed to the work-a-day world, they have left it to others. The drift to defeatism has continued, and unless it is checked, not only employers, but every employee, will suffer, if idealists and would-be dictators usurp the authority of experienced men.”

Most of us will be tempted to greet with lifted eyebrow the assertion that business men, through timidity or preoccupation with “work-a-day” affairs, have been neglectful of praising and “explaining” private capitalism. We have lived in a world where every instrument of propaganda—

from church and school to printing press, movies and radio—is continuously employed in conditioning us to a devout faith in the beneficence of the capitalist system. Powerful as is this propaganda to which we are subjected from cradle to grave, however, our surroundings have proven even more powerful counter-propaganda. They have shown the capitalist system to be no longer capable of providing economic security and the means of a good life for the mass of Canadians. Unemployment, poverty, ill-health, a grinding servitude to the “employer,” on the one hand; and on the other, a niggardly “charity” which is by its very nature inadequate and debasing, and which is merely a means of shifting some of the burden of capitalism's failures onto those with modest incomes while leaving the swollen pockets of the owning class virtually untouched. Natural resources, scientific discovery and inventive skill are diverted from the service of their rightful beneficiaries, the people as a whole, and forced to pay tribute to a small class of exploiters. Knowledge and education are circumscribed and directed in the interests of this same class. Production of the very necessities of life is governed by considerations of profit for the few, instead of the needs of the many, while the finished techniques of propaganda and salesmanship are focussed on the stimulation of unhealthy desires which will ensure a market for the more “profitable” non-essentials. These are the characteristics which the ordinary people of Canada have been taught by the grim evidence of circumstances to recognize as the essential “benefits” of capitalism. They are not merely “errors.” They are ineradicable features of an outworn system in a world of unprecedented fruitfulness. The claim that “capitalism” has been responsible for that fruitfulness is hooey. On the contrary it has acted as a brake both on productiveness and equitable distribution, and has withheld from the common man the advantages of scientific development, for which it can claim no credit itself, but over which it has obtained an octopus-like control. It must give place to a system in which economic planning provides for every member of our Canadian society the degree of security and opportunity which laissez-faire capitalism, despite its “healthy” advantages, has proven itself incapable of providing.

The significant point about such articles as that in *Canadian Business*, therefore, is not their disingenuous and shopworn defense of a profit-motivated economy, but the evidence they furnish that those to whose advantage it is to perpetuate such an economy are already employing their faculties in an active drive for its restoration after the war. Those who have rebuked others for presuming to define the social issues implicit in this war are



themselves engaged in an attempt to undermine and frustrate the advance towards social betterment which provides the real inspiration for the people who are doing the hard working and fighting. All the chief propaganda media are still in the hands of the champions of the old order; they are not likely to overlook the advantage that this gives them. But experience teaches that should these instruments, powerful as they are, prove ineffectual in bamboozling the common people once again, those who wield them will not stop at propaganda. Ways will be found of dealing with those apostates who see the handwriting on the wall and are honest enough to admit it, so that "those capable of strong industrial leadership" may "assume their rightful place in the free world of tomorrow." Although, to adopt *Canadian Business*' own metaphor in referring to socialism, "no mention of the iron fist can be found in the glowing prospectus" for "a vigorous restoration of what is usually tagged democratic capitalism," its shadow is plainly discernible between the lines. Let us remember, before it is too late, that it was the industrialists of Germany who helped Hitler to seize power.

Those, therefore, who believe that this war is not merely a war for the survival of democracy, but a social revolution in which democracy must be revitalized and freed from its shackles, should not take too lightly such articles as that in *Canadian Business*. Together with what we see happening all around us, these mutterings of an old order with its back to the wall provide increasing proof that this war must be fought on two fronts, one external and the other internal, and that these are one and indivisible. The call to arms issued to the enemies of genuine democracy on the home front is equally a warning and a summons to its friends to close their ranks and marshal their forces against the internal foe.

## O Canada

The Labor Leader is convinced that to date nothing has been advanced by so-called "progressive thinkers," that rises superior to competitive industrial capitalism. (From an editorial in *The Labor Leader* (Toronto), June 12, 1942)

"When the idea of Army Week was first discussed we approached some of the big advertising agencies and laid the idea before them. We were amazed at their quick response. They took the idea up fast, seeing the great possibilities of an Army Week."—J. W. G. Clark, Director of Public Relations (army and air), and chairman of the national executive committee for Army Week.

Agriculture Minister Gardiner told the Commons this afternoon the one condition which would cause a party government to impose conscription for overseas service would be that **DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS WERE THREATENED WITH DESTRUCTION**. In such a condition, said Mr. Gardiner, none could oppose such a decision.

(*Victoria Daily Times* (Victoria) June 15, 1942)

"... I am a British Columbian and I am a Canadian, but above all I am a Britisher. Being a Britisher is above being a Canadian, being a British Columbian or being a member of any political party."

"I have no sons but, by God, if I had a son and he did not enlist I would shoot him myself."

Mr. Cruickshank called for realism and action by the government and members.

(*The Vancouver Sun*, June 30, 1942)

And this was not entirely deplorable. The so-called "class" system of Britain is not altogether a sinister thing. There is something in the British mentality that demands a "gentry" to which the lowlier folk may look up, and in which, though they may grouse about injustice and inequality, they continue to take an inordinate pride.

(From an editorial in the *Windsor Star*, June 4, 1942)

Suddenly, despite the growing darkness, a Russian fighter swooped down and landed gracefully. A crowd of airmen ran to it. We joined them. So here were the "Stalin Hawks," the *Stalinskies Sokoly*. How often I had seen them on the screen! What good, fine, strong, and yet human faces they all had!

(Alexander Werth in *Liberty*, June 20, 1942)

Jacqueline Sprung, 18-year-old Toronto city hall switchboard operator, has designed a new personal budget to absorb the increased "take" out of her pay envelope. Her salary is only about \$14.40 a week, but her tax for 1942... will be \$79.50... Miss Sprung has already given up silk stockings. She wears none at all... She saves leg paint for dances and parties.

... The increased tax Miss Sprung met by "stealing a little" from entertainment and cosmetics... She stole another quarter from lunches and tacked it on war savings stamps... Clothes, the largest item in Miss Sprung's budget, outside of board, suffered relatively slight injury. "I think it is our duty to keep presentable," she said.

(From a Canadian Publishers' War Finance Publicity Committee News Release)

This month's prize of six months subscription goes to E. Kreutzweiser, Saskatoon, Sask. All contributions should contain original clipping, date and name of publication from which taken.







THE WRECKAGE

*Lawrence Hyde*

# Economic Consequences of Price Fixing

E. A. Beder

**P**RICE FIXING has many historical precedents. It was attempted by the Emperor Diocletian as far back as 301 A.D. The results of this edict according to the historian Lactantius were that

the dealers, required to sell at lower prices than they had paid, concealed their merchandise, scarcity increased, street brawls followed in which blood was shed, and it became necessary to let the law drop into disuse.

Price fixing for corn was attempted in Frankfurt in 794 A.D., and experiments were made in price control by the guilds and the government in England in the Middle Ages. During the French Revolution an extensive system of maximum price fixing was attempted, and in 1777 Massachusetts fixed the prices of both commodities and labor.

During the world war price fixing was widely adopted by many countries. Germany, Austria, England, the United States, Australia and New Zealand fixed prices on many leading products.

There is, therefore, nothing new about price fixing. What is new today is the extent to which price fixing has imposed a totalitarian control upon all fields of economic activity, and the questions raised in the mind of the onlooker by these evidences of a new state power.

To evaluate the economic consequences of price fixing it is necessary to look far beyond the technical horizons which ceiling prices have imposed. It is not simply that the state dictates the price of a pound of sugar or forbids the manufacturer of men's pants to supply them with cuffs. If one saw price fixing only in its narrower manifestations one might reasonably conclude that these things were war measures and would vanish with the return to peace.

Price fixing and the whole machinery of controls that it has produced must be seen as a technological and economic transformation hastened into utilization by the war and widening its impact after the war has ended. The whole process of production and distribution has felt its weight and the rationalization that has come about through its wartime application must profoundly affect the future. What we have already witnessed is economically the shape of things to come.

Although the Roosevelt administration had

struggled valiantly with the problems that faced it since 1932, no one will claim that any solution was found or even approached until the outbreak of the war. "State interference" was a rallying cry for all opposed to the New Deal, although they had no program to put forward that did not involve state aid in some form. What this war has emphasized is the scale upon which state aid may be invoked in the economic life of the nation. Besides the billions now lavished on war by the treasury, the most grandiose dreams of the New Dealers seem picayune. What is five billions of state expenditure today in the light of two hundred billions for war? We may not have inflation after the war but certainly we will have an inflated sense of state spending.

The realization of the possibilities of state action is the first important lesson that will emerge after this war is over. And from this will flow the various schemes and controls which will be deemed necessary to ensure the 'new prosperity.'

Let us first see the extent of the changes that already have taken place or have been proposed in our economy. To set them down in briefest form:

1. Concentration of production.  
Over 75 percent of war contracts placed with 56 corporations.
2. Elimination of small business.  
Small manufacturers cannot get raw material.  
Small retailers squeezed out of business.
3. Selling techniques changed.  
Advertising drops. Radio programs cut.  
Newspaper revenues affected. So are their opinions.
4. Vertical concentration in business.  
Link production from raw to finished goods.  
Protect supply, save on freights.
5. Industrial standardization.  
Pooling of patents and models.  
Elimination of countless excess sizes, types, etc.
6. Government enforcement of price agreements.  
State sets prices for host of products.
7. Quality changes in merchandise.  
Ersatz development in all fields.
8. Regulation of labor.  
Labor frozen in war industry.  
Probable allocation of all labor, including women.
9. State supply of capital.  
New industries financed by state.  
Over \$10,000,000,000 state investment in new plants.
10. State as Market.  
No competitive struggle for business.  
State gives open order for over 50 percent of production.

Just to set these facts down is to realize that the state cannot abandon its production and price controls with the cessation of warfare. To do so would result in competitive chaos. No administration could sanction this, therefore the controls and the price fixing must be maintained in principle. But now comes the question of how to re-arrange the economic pattern within the controls?

The state would wish to ensure a stable price level and full employment after the war, but in a profit economy that is tantamount to saying that they must make production profitable for the mass of producers. 'Good' prices are therefore essential. But experience has shown in the many valorization schemes that were attempted before this war, that fixing prices is not enough. It is also necessary to regulate production so that supply may be related to demand. And further, because other nations may be animated by the same ideas, and might be willing to fix the prices of their products (which could be of a similar nature) at slightly lower levels to gain the market, the well-intentioned state must erect barriers against foreign competition. Thus state action would be necessary to

1. Fix prices.
2. Set production quotas.
3. Establish import (and export) control to maintain the price level.

Every one of these basic points contradicts the tenets of capitalist production. It is therefore clear that state action in behalf of economic security after the war means a definite break with the concepts of private initiative and free competition. Economic control will center power in the state rather than in the mysterious action of the market. But although the state will take over power, how can it transmit its fine intentions to the masses?

A fixed price is no guarantee of stability in competitive production. Technological advances reduce costs, but this reduction is not an even one, it accrues only to those with the most scientific processes and plants, which is to say to those with the biggest capital. A certain price level might yield a satisfactory profit margin for some concerns, but smaller producers might have a hard time existing under it. To fix the price so high that all could 'make money' would bear inequitably upon the consumer.

How would the production quotas be adjusted? Peacetime demand differs entirely from wartime need. In war there is practically an unlimited call for goods, rationing has to be resorted to; beside commodity shortages the supply of labor is found to be inadequate. In peace there are limits to consumption despite the fact that no nation has yet approached them. The main problem is how

to keep the millions employed; the new millions, it might be pointed out, and the new plants and techniques that have been developed which need less and less human labor per unit. The new economic planning will call for some hair-raising computations in civilian consumption when they are based upon the productive power that will be available in this country at the end of the war. But let us assume that goals have been fixed, who will give way to whom in allotment for the market?

And on what basis will imports and exports be allowed? Importers and exporters compete among themselves for business. Who will be favored?

We have reached what may be called the state's dilemma. It dare not surrender existing controls for fear of the chaos that will ensue, and if it pushes the controls in peacetime, it will break the back of free competition.

Does this mean that it will retreat from its adventure in benevolence? By no means, for we have postulated its well-meaning over too wide a background. The state cannot secure all producers in capitalist production. It can secure only the large ones. Just as in war production 56 corporations obtained over three quarters the volume of business and thousands of small producers were forced to give up and vanish from the scene, so in the matter of peacetime controls; these will be adjusted to safeguard the large units. We have seen the small producer as a wartime casualty; he is destined also to be a victim of the peace.

Despite Mr. Thurman Arnold and his vision of cartels being dispossessed of their monopoly (after the war, of course) just the opposite development will take place. Mr. Arnold inveighed against Standard Oil of New Jersey and other giant capital combinations for their international price fixing, but Standard and the others are functioning and will continue to after the conflict. It is Mr. Arnold who will not function then.

Big scale production is inevitable because our technique demands it. It is most efficient, most controllable, most suited to consumer needs. But it must have an immense market to operate satisfactorily. The state after this war will furnish this market. This is the central driving force that will come out of this war. The state, customer of the big corporations, will call for a vast variety of products to keep the wheels of industry turning, and in certain instances will also furnish the plants to produce them. The plants already exist, as a matter of fact; ten billion dollars worth of them are being operated today by big capital which makes a profit out of their operation. This is better than having the plants as a gift, it leaves the government holding the bag of obsolescence.



The end of free competition will entail no disaster for big capital. It is amusing in this regard to read the editorials of the Conservative press deploring 'state interference with business,' or to peruse the statements of heads of corporations viewing with alarm 'the curtailment of free enterprise.' They seem to have no inkling of the bonanza that awaits them. They see only the state reaching out for power over them. But what will the state do with this power?

The all-powerful state will stand ready to advise big capital what shall be made, arrange that there shall be no overproduction, fix the 'right' price, and furnish the market directly or indirectly. The giant corporation trains itself to accept orders, then produces the goods and pockets the profit. State interference, but also the apotheosis of capitalism. Its transformation to the highest stage—its dream come true! Free competition eliminated, production controlled, profits ensured, even capital risks cut down by the state underwriting of new ventures. A federal housing program, for example, would find the state making the plans and the big corporations the building profits. The risks involving the ownership of the new projects would be entirely state borne.

It will be noted that such a concept of the state as sponsor and protector of big capital is entirely at variance with the declared objectives of all the democracies; however, it is not a question of the declarations but of economic organization. No administration incurred more bitter hostility from big capital than the Roosevelt regime. Wall Street was almost psychopathic in its rage and rancor against the president. Yet when war production became a necessity the 56 giant corporations ruled the roost. It was not a question of Mr. Roosevelt being favorable or unfavorable to big capital. Big business got the orders because the action was made inevitable by reason of our mode of production. In the same way when action is made necessary by the problems of peace, the mode of production will again dominate the course to be followed.

A new age of rationalization looms ahead. A thousand instances could be cited where the waste of competitive methods has stamped itself upon the consciousness of those who are called upon to administer the war effort and the national planning that is at least, in part, called into being. Since it is fashionable to cite Canada in the realm of price fixing and related problems, Mr. Donald Gordon, the head of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board in a speech at Montreal declared that it was inconceivable that the country could return to the waste and inefficiency of the competitive system after the war.

Rationalization demands big scale production and

big scale production must have state intervention to assure its smooth working. The political heads of the state may not like such a development, they may quarrel with and pin-prick the demands of the big corporations as programs are discussed. But this does not lead to a change in the economic organization of the state. It leads only to a change in the political heads.

The actions of the democratic governments speak louder than their words of sympathy for small business. Despite the projected plans, bills and loans for the small man, every Washington agency admits he is destined to be the unhappy victim of a force they cannot control.\* The economic consequences of price fixing express themselves in a state power that regulates all economic activity, but is forced to give over to big capital the task of maintaining this economic activity upon the most advantageous terms. Some people call this fascism.

\*The national small business conference held at Chicago forecast a mortality of 130,000 out of a total of 184,000 small firms.

## Distribution of Income in British Columbia

*Eugene Forsey*

**E**XCEPT IN 1931 AND 1940, British Columbia has had the largest per capita income of any province in Canada, and has always been well above the dominion average, though the margin is getting smaller. A brief table will illustrate the point:

### PER CAPITA INCOME (1926 dollars)

	Canada	Ontario	British Columbia
1926	\$433	\$492	\$555
1929	471	559	602
1933	318	400	406
1937	414	515	522
1940	464	582	561

But if British Columbia has been relatively fortunate as compared with the rest of the country, it does not follow that all British Columbians have shared the good fortune in equal measure, or anything like it. As in the other provinces, there are wide disparities.

*Bond interest and dividends* had by 1929 reached 118.2 percent of their 1926 level. In 1930 they touched 132.5, or over 12 percent above 1929. In 1931 they were still 10 percent above 1929. In 1932 they sank to their lowest point, slightly more than one percent below 1929. Only in 1932 and 1933 were they at all below 1929, and then only slightly. In 1936 they reached a new high, slightly



above 1930, and in 1937 an all-time peak, nearly 19 percent above 1929 and nearly six percent above 1930. In 1940, after falling for two years, they rose again to 114.6 percent of 1929, or slightly above 1930.

*Net farm income*, which in 1926 was slightly larger than bond interest and dividends, rose very much faster, to a pre-depression peak in 1929 of 166.2 percent of 1926. At this point it was 43 percent larger than bond interest and dividends. It fell slightly in 1930, and markedly in 1931. In 1932, at its lowest point, it was only 48.8 percent of 1929, a striking contrast with bond interest and dividends, which were now about 37 percent larger than farm income. In 1936 farm income was still only about 77 percent of 1929; but in 1937 it was slightly larger than in 1929. In 1939 it reached 129.1 percent of 1929 (214.5 percent of 1926), and in 1940 it was almost 21 percent above 1929 (or about double its 1926 figure). In 1937 farm income was about 32 percent larger than bond interest and dividends, in 1940 almost 60 percent larger. Clearly, British Columbia agriculture, though it suffered severely in the depression, came through much more easily than agriculture in most of the rest of the country, and its recovery since the depression has been very striking, far exceeding that in other provinces. British Columbia is the only province in which, in 1940, farm income has improved over its 1926 position in comparison with bond interest and dividends; and the improvement is very marked.

With *fishermen* it is another story altogether. For them 1926 was the peak. By 1929 their income was less than 90 percent of 1926. In 1932 it was barely one-eighth of 1926. Its highest point since was in 1938, when it was only slightly over half of 1926. In 1926, bond interest and dividends were only slightly larger than fishermen's income. In 1932 they were over nine times as large, and in 1940 still one and two-thirds times as large.

Total *salaries and wages combined* in 1929 reached 117 percent of 1926. They then fell to a low point, in 1933, slightly more than two-thirds of their 1929 figure. In 1937 they were nearly back to the 1929 level. In 1938 they dropped back slightly, and in 1939 rose slightly above 1929. In 1940 they were 106.2 percent of 1929.

*Salaries in manufacturing* reached a peak in 1931 at 134.5 percent of 1926, or 12 percent above 1929. Only in 1933 did they drop below their 1929 level, and then only by about one-and-a-half percent. They reached a new peak in 1935, 17 percent above 1929, and in 1938 stood at 144.5 percent of 1929. *Wages in manufacturing*, on the other hand, reached a peak in 1929, at 111.4 percent of 1926 (the corresponding figure for salaries

was 120.1, for bond interest and dividends 118.2). In 1933 they were only 57.2 percent of 1929: a striking contrast to bond interest and dividends, 99.2 percent, and salaries, 98.4 percent of 1929. By 1937 wages were about three percent above 1929 (bond interest and dividends 18.6, salaries 36.9); and in 1938 they were at just the 1929 level (while bond interest and dividends were 14.6 percent, and salaries 44.5 percent above it).

*Salaries in mining* reached a peak in 1929, at 139 percent of 1926. By 1933 they had dropped to about 82 percent of their 1929 level. In 1934 they were slightly above 1929, and thereafter rose steadily to a 1938 figure almost 29 percent above 1929. *Wages in mining* reached their peak in 1929 at 119 percent of 1926. At the bottom of the depression, 1933, they were only 53.4 percent of 1929. In 1938 they were still only 96.6 percent of 1929. The contrast with salaries, and with bond interest and dividends, is again marked. Both salaries and wages in mining, it will be noted, rose much faster than in manufacturing, during the period 1926-1929, but also fell much faster and farther during the depression, and rose much less during recovery.

*Combined salaries and wages in construction* show the usual sharp fluctuations: a high, in 1929, of 140 percent of 1926; a low, in 1933, of 29.3 percent of 1929; a recovery, in 1940, to 79.4 percent of 1929. The income of *individual enterprisers in construction* shows even more spectacular variations: a high, in 1929, of 194.1 percent of 1926; a low, in 1932, of 18.7 percent of 1929; a recovery, in 1940, to only 31.4 percent of 1929.

*Combined salaries and wages on the railways* reached, in 1929, a high of 114.8 percent of 1926. In 1933 and 1934 they were less than three-quarters of their 1929 figure. In 1939 they reached 89.2 percent of 1929, but in 1940 fell off to 87.2.

In view of the contrasts between wages on the one hand, and salaries, bond interest and dividends on the other, it is hardly surprising that British Columbia has the strongest urban CCF movement in Canada.

#### NOVEL CONTEST

Authors will be interested in the following item:

The Ryerson Press announces an annual award of the sum of \$500 which will be made to any Canadian author whose manuscript is declared first choice by the judges of the Ryerson Fiction Award. Furthermore, no manuscript should contain less than 50,000 words or exceed 150,000 words. All manuscripts submitted must be typed, double-spaced and hitherto unpublished in any form. Translations of French novels, by Canadian authors, which have not appeared in serial form, are eligible. Each manuscript should bear the author's full name and address, must be postmarked not later than March 1, 1943, and addressed to The Ryerson Fiction Award, The Ryerson Press, 299 Queen St. W., Toronto, Canada.

# James Farrell's Crusade

Samuel Levenson

THE PUBLICATION of James Farrell's latest novel, *Ellen Rogers*, makes this as good a time as any to examine and summarize his contribution to American literature. As it happens, *Ellen Rogers*, like most of Farrell's recent books, is not a good job; but, almost because of that, it seems to indicate that this is the time to examine the merits and demerits of Farrell's kind of writing, and to discover where Farrell is going, if anywhere.

Until recently both critics and the general public have had some difficulty in appraising Farrell's worth. In the first place, they have been overwhelmed by the number and bulk of his writings. In the past nine years Farrell has published no fewer than thirteen books, which include long and short novels, stories and literary criticism. Furthermore, his long novels, which comprise the bulk of his work, are without obvious form, distinguishable plots or conventional characters; consequently, they are difficult to assimilate. They make no concessions to "public taste," and they alienate certain groups of readers for reasons so clear as to be enumerable. Farrell writes mainly about Irish-Americans, but the Irish in America, far from extolling his works, refuse to consider his descriptions of Irish-American life, even that found in the slums of South Chicago, as accurate or just. They are further repelled by his anti-clericalism and left-wing leanings. For Farrell is, to some extent, a Marxist; enough of a Marxist, that is, to repel some conservatives, but again, such a special kind of a Marxist as to repel even the majority of Marxists. Finally, Farrell handles sex without gloves, thereby giving many a library additional reason not to put his books upon its shelves.

Not that Farrell deserves any sympathy. He has obviously written as he wanted to write, and his works have been published. He has chosen his own road and can hardly be surprised if those whom he has not consulted think that that road leads to perdition or worse. But those who have a tenderness for mavericks, and a respect for let-the-chips-fly naturalism will find his career interesting and his works stimulating. And no one can ignore a writer who has written what most critics consider one of the greatest novels of our time, the trilogy known as *Studs Lonigan*.

## II

James Thomas Farrell was born in Chicago thirty-seven years ago. He attended parochial elementary and high schools, where he was interested

in sports and little else. By the time he got through he had won letters in baseball, football and basketball. Then he attended classes at De Paul University and at the University of Chicago. At the latter institution he wrote a short story as part of his school work which was the genesis of *Studs Lonigan*. During and after his school career, he clerked for an express company, worked in a cigar store, sold advertising, reported for a Hearst newspaper, and toiled in a gas station. He left the University of Chicago in 1929, and his first book, *Young Lonigan*, was published in 1932. *Judgment Day*, the last of the Lonigan series, appeared three years later.

In the middle volume of the Lonigan trilogy, a character named Danny O'Neill is described briefly as a product of Chicago's South Side then enrolled at the University of Chicago. As he sits in the gas station where he is employed part-time, he meditates on the discrepancy between life as he had found it in the slums of Chicago and life as it was supposed to be.

He had been told things, told that the world was good and just, and that the good and just were rewarded, lies completely irrelevant to what he had really experienced; lies covering a world of misery, neuroticism, frustration, impecuniousness, hypocrisy, disease . . . he wanted to be a writer . . . to purge himself completely of the world he knew, the world of Fifty-eighth Street, with its God, its life, its lies, the frustrations he had known in it, the hate it had welled up in him . . . It would all go in a newer, cleaner world. He seethed with sudden dizzying adolescent dreams and visions of this new world. He, too, would destroy the old world with his pen; he would help create the new world . . . Some day, he would drive this neighborhood and all his memories of it out of his consciousness with a book. He swerved again from disillusionment to elation.

*Studs Lonigan* is, of course, the book that Danny O'Neill, alias James Farrell, wrote. Here is Farrell's world, more than a thousand pages of it. Here is the seething life of South Chicago, with its drinking parties, street corner loafers, gangs, politicians, priests, stores, houses of prostitution. The first volume of the trilogy was mistaken by some reviewers for a sociological tract; and in its formlessness, lack of plot and absence of "style," it is easy to understand how they got that impression. Farrell does not hesitate to devote twenty or more pages to a single slab of experience: a dance, a sermon, a movie, a football or baseball game, *Studs'* initiation into the Order of Christopher (Knights of Columbus). Detail is piled upon

detail until there is laid bare all the means by which the streets educate their youthful inhabitants. Here can be traced the ways in which prejudice against Negroes and Jews arise; how sexual knowledge and drinking habits are communicated; how belief in Father Moylan (Father Coughlin) is created. It is the gang, the family and the church that are the main educators; and their activities are recorded with an unwavering eye, a dictaphonic ear, and a tireless hand.

But the book is more than a sociological document. For one thing, Studs is not a wooden figure upon which Farrell hangs an environment. Studs is a real creation, a permanent addition to that scanty gallery of American portraits which includes Ichabod Crane, Huckleberry Finn and Babbitt. In his lack of culture, prejudices, drinking habits and blind acceptance of the customs of his group, he is typical; but in his secret fears, feelings of inferiority and compensatory dreamings, he is an individual. From the first, Studs wants to be a big shot, rich, tough, important, respected. As he grows older and his health deteriorates, he dreams only of becoming a normal, healthy being, happily married. The third and final volume is keyed entirely in minor, with Studs desperately trying to achieve marriage despite his haunting knowledge that his health is broken, that he is not in love with the girl to whom he is engaged, that the money for the wedding has been squandered in a bad investment.

Studs' barren mental life, it has been pointed out, is not due to lack of imagination. Rather, he is basically too imaginative to endure the constricting lower class life into which he has been born. Strongly emotional, he is sensitive to people and atmospheres, but inarticulate in voicing his feelings. In Ireland, activities of the church and of patriotic groups might have furnished some sort of fruitful discharge for his energies; as it is, only within the gang, with its xenophobia, drinking bouts and sex orgies, can Studs express himself.

There is pathos here, and a good deal of irony. Studs is aware of some of the irony: he, the would-be big shot, unable to swim without fainting, unable to whip a fellow his size, lying in the gutter after an epical New Year's party—Studs "who had once, as a boy, stood before Charley Bathcellar's pool-room, thinking that some day, he would grow up to be strong, and tough, and the real stuff." But much of the irony in the actions and speech of the gang is beyond his comprehension. He and his companions complete a religious mission with full sincerity, only to fall heedlessly into their former practices. They eye lustfully Negro girls who pass them on the street, but beat up the Negro lads who

try to use the public swimming pool that they frequent.

### III

Though Farrell can write, on occasion, with delicacy and tenderness, his more general manner is one of bitterness, wrath and searing naturalism. The words that Studs uses are given without deletion, his experiences are portrayed with stark reality. This takes more than courage; it takes belligerence, and complete faith in the efficacy of truth-telling. *A Note on Literary Criticism*, published in 1936, further exemplifies Farrell's characteristic belligerence. This book was written at a time when many critics and authors, including Farrell himself, were drunk with the heady brew of raw Marxism. Farrell, one of the first to recover, argued in this book for a return to reason. Bluntly he stated that the bifurcation of books into categories of growth and decay, progressive and reactionary, was false; that to fix accurate points of social reference, neither generalities nor wish-fulfillments could be considered, but only the necessity which "flows out of the essential factors of environment, situation, milieu, characters." More than a defense of Dostoevsky, James Joyce, Theodore Dreiser and Marcel Proust, Farrell's literary mentors, the book challenged a whole trend in criticism, and very nearly put Farrell in the dog house.

There is no room in this essay to deal with Farrell's politics, but it has already been indicated that Marxism has influenced his thinking. It might be better to say that he is pleased that Marxist thought agrees with his own conclusions. This, perhaps, is why his fiction has suffered no ill effects from its influence. He is too honest an observer to believe that only a socialist regeneration of society can sweep away the lower class decay represented by Studs and his gang; he knows that fascism is as likely to utilize that decay as socialism. At one time Farrell was close to the communist party, later he became sympathetic to the Trotskyist group. Now, bull-headed as ever, always detesting dogma, he is way out in left field. Now he writes that he is "opposed to conscription, aid to the allies, the new deal, Roosevelt, Willkie, Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini." A stand of this sort requires, obviously, a stubborn honesty and awkward self-confidence, amounting to truculence, of which few beside Farrell are capable.

Farrell's short stories, which are contained in three sizeable volumes, are uneven in quality. They do indicate, however, that Farrell can handle moods of Chekhovian futility with some skill. His favorite theme is recording the thoughts that go through a young man's mind as he wanders idly



through the streets, his wanderings as aimless as his thoughts. Some stories indicate Farrell's determination to present scenes of shame and horror, if only because they have been unrecorded hitherto. But many of the stories are juvenile in concept and treatment, particularly those which deal with college students; they are inept when they deal with Negroes and Jews; some reveal the author's detestation of clericalism as a force constricting the happiness of mankind. He is definitely at his best when he treats of middle-class Irish Catholic families; only here does he get beneath the surface of his characters. Perhaps the greatest merit of his short stories is the one of which Farrell is most clearly aware; that, with all their defects, they are conscious and honest attempts to break away from the old American curse of plotted and systematized-to-death short stories.

In 1936, with the publication of *A World I Never Made*, Farrell began a new long novel dealing with Danny O'Neill, whose appearance in *Studs Lonigan* has been described. For a time the formlessness and psychological detail which gave *Studs* its power seemed to be leading Farrell into a morass of pointless psychological anecdote. In *Father and Son* he successfully extricates himself, but it remains definitely inferior to his earlier series. Danny O'Neill merely duplicates Studs' experiences on a somewhat higher social plane, with less freshness and intensity. Farrell's attempt to enlarge the world he describes by including a full-length study of Danny's father, adds little to the book, first, because Jim O'Neill, despite the blurb, is not a "man of inherent dignity and nobility," but simply a typical Irish father, and second, because there is no interrelation of development or emotion, or even contact, between the father and son. Each moves in his own world; and neither world, I am sorry to say, adds much to what Farrell has already described. In succeeding volumes Danny, I imagine, will enter the writing and radical world; no doubt, these will be of greater interest.

Farrell's latest novels raise fundamental questions concerning his literary future. Is he writing too much? Has his style become a mannerism? Is detail, no matter how well observed, enough to base a novel on? *Young Gallegher's Crusade*, published in 1939, relates various incidents in the life of an ardent young follower of Father Moylan. It is a short novel, laudable in its attempt to explain why certain people become Coughlinites, but remarkable mainly for the flatness of the writing, and the use of such amazing expressions as "jolly face," "dense expresson," and "pretty good job." The hero is a washed-out and unconvincing imitation of Studs Lonigan.

*Ellen Rogers* is further proof that naturalistic reporting, without sympathy for at least one main character, or great psychological insight, is not enough to make a good novel. The subject of this book is a love affair between a vain, empty-headed nineteen-year-old girl and a boy two years older who considers himself a Nietzschean superman. Both characters are not only detestable but uninteresting as well. If Farrell set out to show that even young love can be unromantic, he succeeded; but the reader cannot be blamed for sharing his lack of sympathy with the whole business.

The question, finally, of Farrell's future is complicated by the fact that, no matter how good his later books are, they will inevitably be compared with *Studs Lonigan*. Only such works as Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle*, Dos Passos' *U.S.A.*, and Dreiser's *An American Tragedy* can survive such a test. *Studs* is something more than a book to be tested by academic standards of grace, imagination and characterization. It is a chunk of inferno, lusty, pathetic, erotic, grim as Fifty-eighth Street itself. It is a segment of American life, a segment only too familiar to most of us.

## Farming Without Dirt

Ross L. Holman

**B**ACK in the early thirties, W. F. Gericke, a University of California professor, asked the permission of his college to try out a new system of farming that would seemingly turn the processes of nature wrongside out. The scheme looked so cockeyed to the university authorities they told him they could not afford to risk their operating funds in such crazy experimentation.

Not to be outdone Professor Gericke set up the experiments in his own backyard. Neighbors started peeking over their back fences to see what it was all about. They saw him knocking together long trough-like contraptions that looked as though he was getting ready to feed a bunch of hogs—though they couldn't detect any other evidences of swine being a part of his plans. Besides—he did not call those long containers "troughs." He spoke of them as "tanks." Whenever the curious spectators tried to learn what was on his mind, the professor was as silent as the sphinx.

He was later seen putting water into the tanks and mixing a salty looking concoction like a witch doctoring a brew with magic potions. He stretched

over the top of the troughs about an inch above the water a wire netting on which he spread sawdust, shavings or peat moss, depending on what was convenient at the time. This he dampened and in it planted seed.

Shortly after that more neighbors began to line the back fence. They poured in from all over town and from half way across the continent. By this time spectators were seeing more than tanks. Out of those containers were growing tomato plants that were shooting up so fast they seemed to disregard all the known laws of growing speed. The seed sprouted in the sawdust, shot their stalks up and their roots down through the wire screen into the tank water below. They were doing all of this growing without touching a speck of dirt at any place—only water.

Finally the plants were covered with huge tomatoes as thick as grape clusters. The stalks were so tall they had to be propped with long poles and the professor gathered his tomatoes with a step ladder.

It was in 1938 that Professor W. F. Gericke announced to the world this newly developed system of soilless farming. He gave it the laboratory-sounding name of "hydroponics." Briefly it was a system by which plants are grown in water treated with the same chemical nutrients on which the same plants feed when grown in soil. The proportions of each nutrient vary according to what is being grown and it is a job for a chemist to figure out. The extra large growth you get from tanks is due to the fact that you can control the exact amount needed in water better than in soil.

When Professor Gericke's completed experiment was announced to the world it was a big story and newswriters made the most of it. It had plenty of novelty and what it lacked in fact they made up in imagination. The professor's mail jumped from a few letters a day to a sack full. Restaurant owners wrote in to know if they could grow all their vegetable needs in tanks on the roof and send them down to the kitchen by chute. Some of the newswriters pictured a housewife stepping into the pantry and gathering tomatoes and okra from her own tank-grown stalks for dinner. Some of them even had tomatoes growing out of dresser drawers, sugar bowls and coal bins.

But in all of this wild speculating there is no one more conservative in his estimate of what hydroponics can do than the professor himself. The system has great possibilities, but he insists that many of the claims made for it are far-fetched.

After all, the determining factor in the success of most every new development is not its novelty but

its economic possibilities. The future of hydroponics will not be determined by whether it will grow bigger and better crops than soil culture, but whether it will sprout enough dollars to pay for them. Professor Gericke gave the new soilless enthusiasts a jolt when he announced that the cost of tank farming per acre would be \$4,000. Not only that, but it is still not a venture in which an amateur can plunge without quite a bit of study in the chemical needs of each plant he grows and how to successfully apply those needs. Dr. Gericke believes, however, that the rules of operation will, in time, become so well standardized that most beginners can successfully apply them. For those who wish to give soilless culture a fling on a trial and error basis, some popular science journals are printing formulas for the chemical mixtures and methods of using them.

While the \$4,000 cost per acre of soilless culture looks forbidding at first glance, you can breathe a sigh of relief when you learn that under good management you can grow on that acre 20 times as much as you would normally expect by farming it in the good old fashioned way. But even at that, it is still an expensive agriculture, though there are many special conditions under which it will pay out. It is entirely possible, however, that the per-acre cost of tank farming may be considerably reduced with further study.

It is not yet clear as to what extent hydroponics will fit into the scheme of things in the average home. One authority says that a soilless garden will be as much a part of the equipment of the future home as a sun porch. In fact, one subdivision builder in one city plans putting a hydroponics greenhouse with every home he sells so the buyer can have fresh vegetables all winter.

As a defense measure hydroponics could have great value. A country like England, for instance, that has to import a large portion of its food supplies, could set up tank farms and increase its production on the same area 20 times. Increased production of field crops like wheat and corn can in an emergency be stepped up this way tremendously. Think what a huge amount of freight charges and shipping space this might save in a submarine-infested world!

The value of chemiculture consists not only in controlling the growth of vegetables but also their food value. It is well known that the nutritive value of garden products is limited by the amount of minerals and other plant feeding chemicals in the soil. In soilless farming it is a simple matter to pitch into the tank enough nourishing chemicals to bring the food value of the product up to maximum.



*odd coats and  
Trousers are  
in style again!*

**R**EGARDLESS of your age, sex or physical condition you can be a "Thrift Columnist." If you've ever said "What can I do to help win this war? . . . this is it."

Live simply, thriftily. Don't spend a dime on things you don't need or can do without. *If you want Victory put every cent you can save into War Savings Stamps.*

One way you can save is on clothes. If you're a woman, restyle last year's hat and last year's dresses. Make over children's clothes. If you're a man . . . look in your clothes closet. *Odd coats and trousers are in style again.* Your tailor can make you a Victory Suit, in the latest style, by trimming worn cuffs and turning collars on suits you may have discarded.

New materials and labour are needed for uniforms . . . new dollars are needed to buy them. Put every dollar you can . . . and more . . . into War Savings Certificates. You'll get \$5 back for every \$4 you invest.

*Buy War Saving Stamps from banks, post offices, druggists, grocers, telephone offices, and other retail stores.*



Take care of your shoes. Dry them carefully if they have been wet. Keep the surface polished and have minor repairs made early.



Get your tailor to make you a Victory Suit . . . by turning the worn collar and trimming the cuffs from the suit you may have discarded. (A Victory Suit is your uniform for the home front. Over 400,000 Canadians are wearing battle dress.) Invest the cost of a new suit in more War Savings Certificates.

**BE A Thrift COLUMNIST**

**KEEP BUYING  
WAR SAVINGS  
STAMPS**

NATIONAL WAR FINANCE COMMITTEE  
THE CANADIAN FORUM



# BOOKS OF THE MONTH

## Summer Reading

GO DOWN MOSES: William Faulkner; Macmillan (Random House); pp. 272; \$3.

THE PRESENT VOLUME is a collection of seven stories of varying length, most of them spun, more or less tangibly, around the activities of the deep-South clan, McCaslin. Readers of the better-known American periodicals will recognize most of them as individually appearing short stories. In one volume they make a remarkably unified whole, though because of their origins there is an excess of introductory and background material. In a sense this is of some benefit to the reader. For the family tree of old Carothers McCaslin is not easily come by, and almost up to the end of the book there are a certain number of persistent genealogical problems.

The white branch of the family, Uncle Ike, "past seventy and nearer eighty than he ever corroborated anymore," Uncle Buck, and his identical twin, Uncle Buddy, who "won Tomey Terrel's wife, Tennie, in the poker game in 1859—'possible strait against three Treys in sight Not called'" and the Edmondses are all authentic and easily identified, but the black, semi-white and Indian connections and dependents remain somewhat obscure. For one thing, they are almost all "impassive, impenetrable"; when they feel anything they "do not show it"; and at all times of emotional stress there is "nothing in their faces". The difficulties presented by this blank black wall the author resolves by using the Dickensian identification disc method of characterization. Thus, Sam, Fathers and old Lucas, though they are in approximate equal measure, negro, proud, impenetrable, and not given to Sirring the youngest of the Edmonds family, may be differentiated by virtue of the fact that old Lucas' pride derives from his descent from old Carothers McCaslin through the male line while his white masters' descent is through the female (and he wears the old McCaslin stovepipe hat as a symbol of that pride) whereas Sam's pride derives from "the Chickasaw chief who had been his father." We are told little more than this by way of introduction. The rest depends upon some imaginative effort on the part of the reader as the stories develop.

It would be easy to over-emphasize the social significance of *Pantaloon in Black*, a study of a grief-stricken negro who commits a murder and is lynched. To do so, however, would only be to under-emphasize its power of understanding of the emotions involved. It is sufficient to say that, with all the minor irritations consequent upon Mr. Faulkner's mannerisms, the author's imagination and style are as fertile, fecund and rank (in the best sense of a usually abused word) as is the Delta bottom, of which he writes, itself. The book makes first-class reading.

G. C. ANDREW

KEEPER OF THE FLAME: I. A. R. Wylie; Macmillan (Random House); pp. 272; \$2.50.

THE AUTHOR OF "My Life With George," "Strangers Are Coming" and other well-known novels including a World War I best seller "Towards Morning," gives us now, in "Keeper of the Flame," a timely story of real suspense and audacity—a "thriller" if you like, certainly

a book one picks up because it "looks interesting," but finds one cannot lay down until the last page is finished.

Although Miss Wylie has a definite style of her own, most of her books and magazine stories seem to have been inspired by great world events. Her "Towards Morning" gave what was considered the best picture of life in Germany at that time. Years later "To The Vanquished" was published, depicting what life under the Nazis meant in the later 1930's. Since then, in many short stories she has attempted to open the eyes of her readers to what happens under a brutal dictatorship.

"Keeper Of The Flame" springs from the present world chaos when anything can happen, and in a really audacious story the author shows how it might have happened here.

The story opens with the announcement of the death of Robert Forrest, a New England state governor. He had been a friend of the underprivileged, champion of labor, guide and counsellor of countless numbers of the younger generation, and the shock of his untimely and apparently accidental death was nation-wide.

Steve O'Malley, a distinguished and lovable war correspondent, having been forced to leave the Nazi-invaded countries because of his passion for truth, and now at loose ends, is asked by his paper to write the inside story of Forrest's life. O'Malley goes to the village where Forrest lived, then to his home, talking with those who loved and worshipped the dead man; seeking intimate information from Forrest's lovely young wife. From this point on, intrigue, mystery, the rumblings of great events past and yet to come, hold the reader's interest with unusual intensity.

Perhaps too fantastic or imaginary a book to be a "great" novel from a literary standpoint, but excellent holiday fare.

E. G. K.

OVERTURE TO DEATH: Ngaio Marsh; pp. 254.

THE CALENDAR: Edgar Wallace; pp. 191.

MR. BABBACOMBE DIES: Miles Burton; pp. 192.

SPADES AT MIDNIGHT: Stephen Maddock; pp. 192.

JEWEL THIEF: Arthur Mills; pp. 192.

SWEET POISON: Rupert Penny; pp. 192.

[The books listed above are published by Collins (White Circle Pocket Novels); 25c each]

THIS IS a very English grill, full of pipes, and massive inspectors, and a persistent, implacable muddling through, which in the skilful hands of the various authors, invariably strips the last thread bare from the murderer in one last dignified interview with the detective. They are nearly all old friends and many of them are quite well worth meeting again, if you like old familiar far-off things. A touch of distinction is given by Miss Marsh, a lavender and old lace flavor by Edgar Wallace; then there is the domestic tragedy type of "Babbacombe," the Bulldog Drummondism of "Spades at Midnight," the "aristocratic" fairylike world of "Jewel Thief," the public school dustiness of "Sweet Poison," and so to the end of the list. They have all served well before. They will serve well again on the sick bed, on the railway journey, over the evening pipe. They would be especially good antidotes to boredom in the House of Commons, Ottawa.

T. W. L. M.

## Post-War Reconstruction

**STRATEGY FOR DEMOCRACY:** J. Donald Kingsley and David W. Petegorsky, with chapters by Pierre Cot, Max Werner, Albert Guérard, Oscar I. Janowsky, and Mordecai Ezekiel; Longmans, Green; pp. ix, 342; \$4.

**THE CHOICE** that confronts us . . . is not, as many seems to imagine, between the status quo and the barbarities of totalitarianism. Rather, it is between the extension of democracy and its destruction." (p. 5) **STRATEGY FOR DEMOCRACY** argues the implications of this statement, presents eloquently the case for the extension of democracy in America now, and discusses the possibilities, techniques, and pitfalls which lie ahead. Although written primarily as a call to action for American progressives, it has much that will be useful to Canadians who are thinking about the present and future of democracy at home and abroad.

Considered as part of the growing literature on post-war reconstruction, it has the great merit of focussing attention on the underlying political possibilities and dangers, and on the economic "compulsives" behind them, rather than on detailed economic blueprints. The authors argue that democracy needs socialism ("democratic collectivism"); that every approach towards it now will make for greater industrial and military efficiency; and that without some approach to it now, there will be little hope of a stable democratic community, either national or international, after the war.

The authors emphasize that the problem of democracy is basically the same as the problem of peace: "the international scene is always a faithful reflection of its national components; the international anarchy of the past several years has been but the image of the anarchy and social conflict that have been the dominating features of our national social structures." (p. 9) The transformation of the capitalist order into an equalitarian socialist order is therefore a prerequisite both of international peace and internal democracy. Such a transformation must be the result of a wide popular movement, the success of which will depend partly on the degree of its understanding of the economic forces at work, and partly on the extent to which it can command the indispensable technical and managerial competence which is at present in the service of capitalist industry and the capitalist state. One of the best parts of the book is that on "The Myth of the Managerial Revolution," in which the argument of James Burnham's recent best-seller is examined. The authors point out that the managerial revolution is not inevitable; indeed, in the sense of an independent managerial class gaining control, is highly improbable. What is possible and dangerous is that reactionary interests will build up the myth of the inevitability of the managerial revolution and use it as a front behind which to increase their own control of the economic and political life of the nation. "The role of the social myth has not been overlooked by our reactionary intellectuals," and a managerial revolution is probable to the degree that this myth becomes widely accepted.

The whole book will strengthen the purpose and perhaps clarify the problems of those who believe that democracy begins at home and who believe that steps towards more real democracy are more important than ever in wartime, since the war is an extension of conflicts within nations, between the wars. C. B. MACPHERSON

## Economy and Friendship

**WORK IN HAND:** Robert Graves, Norman Cameron, Alan Hodge; Macmillan (The New Hogarth Library); pp. 64; 85c.

**THE SAYING** "Good things come in small parcels" is infrequently substantiated by not infrequent little books of poetry. This one is treble an exception, being three books in one of sixty-four pages, all good, with a nice proportion of better and best. The poems are prefaced by the author's note: "These three small books are published under a single cover for economy and friendship," a sensible and exemplary practice at this and any time. The poems themselves are economical, but in such a way as to extend the friendship of writer to reader, their economy being that of cutting a coat that fits from fit cloth.

The seventeen poems by Alan Hodge clothe thoughts often with us, but hard to dress in words without hampering their limbs, such as the presence of absence, the persistence of unsaid things, the timelessness now can have, the graph of national crisis. Here is the latter, characteristic in style and actuality:

### CHANGE OF LANDSCAPE

Oh, yes, a shrinkage was observed  
In every contour one fine day,  
The peaks becoming gently curved,  
The river-mouth a rounded bay.

But sullen did the people look,  
In revolution, as it were,  
Against a landscape which forsook  
Its rough mien for a debonair.

Not till their blunt geography  
Was back on river-mouth and peak  
Did people, by its savagery,  
Again turn human, so to speak.

If, on the other hand, occurred  
Great landslides, making desolate,  
To turn angelic were absurd:  
Rather than that they'd emigrate.

Norman Cameron, who calls himself one of the neat ones in God's awkward squad, is very neat, as poet, in an epigrammatic sense. Several of his thirteen poems are epigrams, one an epigram on an epigram, and in most he chooses to present ungeneralized, but highly significant personal experience, almost everywhere pervaded by curiously amiable laughter, a

Laughter, like sunlight in the cucumber,  
The innermost resource, that does not fail.

Three of this set, "A Visit To The Dead," "The Invader," and "The Firm Of Happiness, Limited," however are concerned with what more immediately concerns us all to-day, and the last-named affords an interesting comparison with the poem of Hodge's quoted above.

All three poets, by suppressing clutter, leave room for the reading mind to move about in, none more than Robert Graves, whose eighteen poems cover a slightly wider scale than those of his two friends, ranging from intensely personal statements (A Love Story, Despite And Still, To Sleep), difficultly expressible sides of common experience (A Stranger At The Party, Language Of The Seasons), epigrammatic verse (The Beast, A Withering

Herb), actualities (Dawn Bombardment, The Shot), and unforced laughter (Dream Of A Climber, Lollochs).

Although a trio such as "History Disowned," "A Visit To The Dead," and "The Worms Of History" make one wonder how much these poets may have worked together, it is especially noteworthy that they never give the impression of a group clustered around some dominant influence. Each remains quite distinct from the other, and nowhere more than in the technical approach, where imitation is most likely to appear.

The title describes this threefold work as "in hand", and so it is, well in hand, having that quality of all skilled handiwork, clear pattern and clean contour. R. F.

## Generosities of War

WE PRISONERS OF WAR: SIXTEEN SOLDIERS SPEAK FROM A PRISON CAMP: Preface by Tracy Strong; Association Press (New York City); pp. 90; \$1 (U.S.A.).

ONE OF THE PARADOXES of war is that its mercies have become more generous as its horrors have become more devastating; and the treatment of prisoners is now chivalrously admitted to reflect on the honor of the army and the culture of the nation whose captives they are."

Prison camp induces thought. Not often very profound thought, to judge from this interesting little book, but definite thought, even analysis at times. Getting that thought down on paper was the result of an essay contest suggested by a Y.M.C.A. secretary who regularly visits German prison camps. The sixteen printed were all written by British officers and soldiers, and were not intended for publication. The Y.M.C.A., however, was impressed with their quality and got permission from the writers and from German and British military authorities. No changes were even suggested by the military censors, says Tracy Strong in his preface.

The editor did a fine job of picking out arresting phrases as titles for the essays: "A Thousand Hairless Pates" — "Living and Partly Living" — "A Crust Has a Flavor Unbelievable" — "Only Part of Me is in Prison." And the book leaves the reader feeling that the camaraderie impelled by casual juxtaposition of social classes in the prison camp has combined with the chance to think things out at leisure to ensure that most of these sixteen—and presumably a great many others whom they represent—will actively insist on a more genuinely democratic Britain after the war.

The writing in general is rather heavy. But "Living and Partly Living" has some neat thinking and phrasing: "Neither are we so far from animal that supreme courage in war is unjustly called monstrous. For if there is one quality that wild animals have and we do not, it is nobility. There is nothing petty in a lion enraged, and surely not even the antelope would call the tigress tedious . . . We saw in each other, during the first few weeks of our capture, how relatively little man has advanced, and how at best we, all of us, were animal, and at worst bestial."

One chap, who divides his brief remarks into thoughts as a soldier, as a prisoner, and as a family man, notes this "perplexing thought" under the third heading: "Would the German, if successful, behave according to propaganda or as the disciplined, decent individual encountered in occupied France and the camp?" Another admits to being "profoundly impressed" when one of the Germans who

captured him said, "We do not hate you. We know that you only serve your country as soldiers, just as we serve ours." He concludes by quoting a senior British officer's remark after capture: "Politics is not the business of a soldier" and observes, "This view seems to have certainly been borne out by facts." Such shallow thinking, which reduces the soldier to the level of the mercenary and would forbid him the dangerous diversion of considering what he fights for is, however, far from typical of the book.

"Only Part of Me is in Prison" contains this evidence of social consciousness admittedly born of prison camp life: "How are the people who will live in our rebuilt industrial areas to have the constant benefits of labor-saving machines and avoid the deadly handling of so much repetitive work? . . . What would most people do with increased leisure if they had it?" And another concludes: "Never again must we cast aside the protective veil of force until we and others working on similar lines have created a greater security to supplant the old power of force." Yet another: "Will not the answer be found when the groups discover an ideal greater than their own to which they can give a common allegiance, and after which they can strive together?"

Regarding the limitations of their life, only two touch on the enforced absence of sexual relations, and neither seems tortured or even particularly inconvenienced by it. One remarks, "In this camp we are a very peaceable and harmonious community. Would it be possible for several hundred of us to live together peacefully in continuous close proximity if our womenfolk were present?" An interesting observation is this: "That individuals normally thoughtless and selfish are now taking themselves to task is evident among one's companions. Roommates who were irritating to others because of their careless habits, and who even took delight in jeering at, and taunting their fellows, have mended their ways. Their manners improved, and they do not show the same sadistic tendencies. This improvement can be noticed in men who are normally quite impervious to counter-attack or appeals to their better nature." P. A. G.

## Miscellany

UNCENSORED FRANCE: Roy P. Porter; Longmans, Green & Co. (The Dial Press); pp. 305; \$3.50.

ONE TURNS with eager interest to any book these days that purports to reveal conditions in Germany or the occupied countries. Much of what we read can be regarded with suspicion and a good deal of the more optimistic reports should be discounted as pure wishful thinking. Some of the more lurid revelations of disgruntled Nazis are more than likely complete fabrication.

Mr. Porter, Associated Press correspondent, in occupied France, from 1937 till a few months ago, writes with a refreshing but telling directness about the things he himself has seen. His stories are brisk and clipped in style, and they ring true whether he speaks of Laval in his office predicting and hoping "that the Germans smash the hell out of the British," or of the pleasant old lady in the Metro who made a game of tripping Nazi officers with her umbrella, and greeting their sense of outrage with a bland "Excuse, please."

Here are pictures of food riots, German soldiers denuding Paris of luxury gifts for their wives and sweet-



hearts, champagne parties for Gestapo officials and quiet documentary visits to the now sadly outmoded Maginot Line. Mr. Porter pictures Laval with brutally unflattering directness, and treats Petain with a kindly generosity. Beyond both he sees hope for "La France Liberée."

J. J. KNIGHTS

**LABOUR CONDITIONS IN WAR CONTRACTS:** With special reference to Canada, Great Britain and the United States. International Labour Office, Studies and Reports, Series D (wages and hours of work) No. 23. Montreal, Canada.

**THE MATERIAL** covered in this study, which is divided into six parts, can be best summarized in the words of the study itself as follows: "The first outlines the purpose of labour clauses in Government contracts and their special significance at the present time. The next three summarize the contract clauses and similar requirements in Canada, Great Britain and the United States which prescribe standards of wages, hours of work and other conditions of employment on work done under Government contract, and in particular on war work. Part V compares the practices followed in the three countries. The final section of the report discusses briefly some of the problems involved in the fixing and enforcement of special conditions applying to war work." The obvious weakness in the position of the Canadian as compared with either the British or American worker is attributable, among other causes, to the paucity of pre-war Dominion measures, to the fact that Canadian measures are often non-mandatory, to constitutional difficulties, and to weakness of organization. This little work is of real importance to everyone interested in the position of Canadian labour today. **LORNE T. MORGAN**

**SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION:** second symposium; Edited by Lyman Bryson and Louis Finkelstein; pp. 559; Conference of Science, Philosophy and Religion in their relation to the democratic way of life; New York.

**THE SYMPOSIUM** is a collection of papers prepared for the 1941 conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion. Convoked by more than a hundred outstanding American scholars, representing 58 leading universities and learned institutions, the conference meets annually at Columbia to study the relationship between the various branches of knowledge and the democratic way of life. The members of the conference are convinced that philosophical discussions today are "not mere mental exercises" as A. A. Berle put it, that they are "a definite part of the world struggle." If democracy is to survive as a political phenomenon, its fundamental principle, the basic belief in freedom and human integrity must be successfully defended against the totalitarian ideologies which preach the all-importance of the state, and the insignificance of the individual. The "symposium" bears witness to the fact, that the foremost scholars of this hemisphere recognize their unique responsibility, that they are all united in the defense of their common faith.

Definition, interpretation and application of principles underlying Western civilization are their method of defense. It is the aim of their discussion (yet not fully realized to be sure) to limit the scope of disagreement between specialists even between the various disciplines themselves, thereby putting an end to the dangerous confusion of our intellectual life which is the direct result

of division of labor in a sphere where it ought not to exist. Once an agreement is reached as to the fundamental truths we live by, as to the ultimate objectives towards which we are moving, such an agreement would prove to be of highest practical importance, forming the only conceivable basis of world reconstruction. Even if this ideal should never be fully realized, it ought to be aimed at. "It is highly probable," writes Professor Haskins, "that the course of human social activities will never be completely intelligently regulated. Yet the trend towards its predominant direction by intellectual forces is unmistakable."

It is manifestly impossible to summarize in a few lines, thirty-odd papers submitted by Christian and Jewish theologians, by educators and philosophers, by scientists and practical men. In all of them, **DEMOCRACY** is the theme; of variations there are many, composed in every known manner of technic. There are brilliant essays on the natural foundations of democracy (M. Schoen), on its spiritual foundations (Princeton group), on the philosophical foundations of democracy and religion (O'Meara). The stake of art in the present crisis (G. Boas), literature and poetry, law and education, are all competently discussed. Theologians write of democratic aspirations in Talmudic Judaism (Ben Zion Bokser), in the Hebrew-Christian tradition (M. Burrows), in the Patristic Ethos (C. Outler), in Thomas Aquinas' theories of political liberty (Yves Simon). Everywhere we find scholars at work to integrate all the known facts from different fields of study—not to parade their pet theories or to insist on disagreements; but to profess a common credo in the language of their respective disciplines.

A. W.

Read

## NEWS

**Judith Robinson's Weekly**

**TELLS THE FACTS WITHOUT RESPECT  
TO PERSONS AND PREJUDICE. PUTS  
THE PUNCH WHERE THE PUNCH  
WILL DO MOST GOOD.**

**Editorial and Business Offices:**

63 WELLESLEY STREET, TORONTO

TELEPHONE RA. 5021

**EVERY FRIDAY, 5c. ONE YEAR, \$2.00.**

OUT-OF-TOWN AGENTS WANTED

## Books Received

- The Philosophy of Love:** Dallas Kenmare; Williams & Norgate, (London, England); pp. 224; 7/6d.
- British Rule in Eastern Asia:** Lennox A. Mills; University of Minnesota Press; pp. 581; \$5 (U.S.A.).
- Education for a New Society:** Ernest Green; Labor Book Service (London, England); pp. 146; 90c in Canada.
- Last Leave and Other Poems:** Dorothy Dumbille; Ryerson; pp. 16; 25c.
- Prayers At a High Altar:** Charles Frederick Boyle; Ryerson; pp. 14; 25c.
- Social Goals and Economic Institutions:** Frank D. Graham; Ryerson (Princeton Univ. Press); pp. 273; \$4.50.
- L'Assurance Mutuelle (Rapport du troisième Congrès Général des Coopérateurs):** Conseil Supérieur de la Coopération (Quebec); pp. 202; \$1.25.
- One-Act Plays from Canadian History:** Hilda Mary Hooke; Longmans, Green & Co.; pp. 157; 60c.
- Tap Roots:** James Street; Longmans, Green & Co. (The Dial Press); pp. 593; \$3.50.
- Peace Now and Forever:** Max Molyneux; Silver-Tonsberg Press (Superior, Wis.); pp. 162; \$1.50 (U.S.A.).
- From Copernicus to Einstein:** Hans Reichenbach; Longmans, Green & Co. (Alliance); pp. 123; \$2.50.
- PAMPHLETS:**
- The Mission of a Small Nation:** Vojta Benes; Czechoslovak National Council of America (Chicago); pp. 111; 50c (U.S.A.).
- What French Canadians Want (Food For Thought series):** Abbé Arthur Maheux; C.A.A.E.; pp. 24; 10c.
- The Bulletin of International News (Vol. xix. No. 11):** The Royal Inst. of Inter. Affairs; (London, England); pp. 506; 1s.
- Report on Housing for Toronto:** Lewis Duncan; pp. 40.
- Nova Scotia Helps the Fighting Man:** Government of Nova Scotia (Halifax, N.S.); pp. 32.
- Canada at War, Supplement to Booklet No. 13:** Director of Pub. Inform., Ottawa; pp. 15; free.
- An Economic Classification of Land:** C. C. Spence and E. C. Hope; Dept. of Farm Management, Univ. of Sask.; pp. 42.
- Planning (No. 188, May 12, 1942):** A broadsheet issued by Political and Economic Planning (London, England); pp. 15.

**Moulton College**  
TORONTO Established 1838

Affiliated with McMaster University

**RESIDENTIAL AND DAY SCHOOL FOR GIRLS**  
Grade I to University Entrance  
School re-opens Sept. 9th  
For Calendar apply to Principal  
MISS MARJORIE TROTTER, B.A.  
88 Bloor St. E., Toronto, Ont.

**CURRENT BOOK**

**Education For A New Society**  
By Ernest Green  
90c  
(postage paid)

Copies are on hand for those joining the LBS now.

Books are published every two months.  
Minimum membership period is one year (6 books).  
Payment may be made for six books in advance, or for each book as received.

Copies of

**TEN ANGELS SWEARING**  
by Francis Williams

**SOCIALISM NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL**  
by Frans Borkenau

**VICTORY OR VESTED INTEREST?**  
by G. D. H. Cole, Harold Laski, and others.

are available now at 90c each.  
For complete information write

**THE CANADIAN FORUM BOOK SERVICE**  
28 Wellington St. West, Toronto

REPRESENTING

**THE LABOUR BOOK SERVICE**  
IN CANADA.

**WANTED**

**SUBSCRIPTION REPRESENTATIVES** to handle our new and renewal subscriptions in centres with a population of over 5,000. Previous experience is not required. Payment is by commission. For details please write

**THE CANADIAN FORUM.**

## TALKING UNION

All I Want, The Union Train, Get Thee Behind Me, Talking Union, Which Side Are You On?, The Union Maid.—Trade Union Songs by the Almanac Singers. 3. 10" records in album . . . \$4.20 and shipped express collect. Order from The Canadian Forum Book Service.

## OLD COPIES

Would subscribers who have old copies or bound volumes they would like to sell please contact the Circulation Dept., at once. Please list the copies or volumes you have, and your price. The first fifteen volumes are particularly needed.

**RESEARCH: CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY.** Government Bureaus, etc. Odd jobs, simple questions, complex investigations, ghosting, all expertly handled. Lowest rates. **JOHN CREHORE**, Box 2329, Washington, D.C.

## SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

# THE CANADIAN FORUM

SUBSCRIPTION DEPARTMENT

28 WELLINGTON STREET WEST  
TORONTO, CANADA

Send The Canadian Forum for

☐ one year \$2

☐ two years \$3

To .....

Address .....

☐ New ☐ Renewal

Please send postal note or money order, or make cheque payable at par in Toronto.

New or Renewal Subscriptions can be paid at any  
**CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS OFFICE**  
at no extra cost

This form, or a copy of it, — must be used —



**HAVE THIS STUB RECEIPTED**

**RECEIVED PAYMENT**

Amount .....

Date .....

for Canadian National Telegraphs

**THE CANADIAN FORUM**

B-42

# Should We Stop Thinking in the Hot Weather ?

It used to be a popular notion that summer was no time for serious reading or thinking. A light novel, a detective story, the more frivolous magazines—these were considered the proper “brain food” to carry out to the hammock. They demanded no thought.

It was never a good notion. Today it is an inexcusable one.

Eating, earning a living, marrying, bearing children, and now fighting, go on all year round, regardless of temperature. So should thinking. And since this summer has brought the war nearer to all of us, good, purposeful thinking is more necessary than ever. You can't *afford* to stop thinking just now. And to give body and direction to your thoughts, to base them on fact rather than fancy, you must have the right kind of reading.

## Hot Weather Thinking Made Easy

There is no better way to beat the thermometer, to stimulate thought and provide your brain with nourishing and backbone-producing diet, than to read **THE CANADIAN FORUM**.

The informative, inquisitive, lively articles and editorials in **THE CANADIAN FORUM** make you **WANT** to think. You forget the heat when you're reading **THE CANADIAN FORUM**. It's one of the easiest and best means of making thinking easy in the hot weather.

You've probably read this number of **THE CANADIAN FORUM**, or are about to read it, or you wouldn't be scanning this page. We'll leave it to you to say, after you've read it through, whether or not we're right.

## Why Not Keep It Up All Year ?

The thought has no doubt occurred to you already—but if **THE CANADIAN FORUM** can do so much for you in the **HOT** weather, why

*The Canadian Forum* needs a large number of new subscribers. It believes that thousands of Canadians would welcome it enthusiastically into their homes if they only *knew* about it. How about *your* friends and acquaintances? Will you introduce it to them? How about obtaining **ONE** new subscriber for *The Canadian Forum* before our next issue appears?

not read it **EVERY** month in the year?

Never was there so much need for Canadians to bring their minds to bear on the questions that concern their own country—on events that are from month to month shaping the destinies of every one of us and determining the kind of world our children will live in.

What happens will depend to a large extent on the kind of thinking **YOU** do right now.

**THE CANADIAN FORUM** has only one aim—to help you to think more clearly about the things that vitally concern you.

## Are You a Selfish Person?

If you are, you'll want to keep a good thing like **THE CANADIAN FORUM** all to yourself. You won't care much whether other people are missing what you have found so valuable.

But if you are really unselfish, you'll want as many people as possible to know about **THE CANADIAN FORUM**. You'll want your friends and acquaintances to know about it.

Well, why not tell them? Why not show them your copy? Better still, why not persuade them to take out a year's subscription? It's a mighty good way to gamble two dollars. But you, if you really know **THE CANADIAN FORUM**, can be sure that they will never regret spending the money.

*Yours for Increased Usefulness*

# THE CANADIAN FORUM

**28 Wellington Street West, Toronto**



